

# Modern Philology

VOLUME XVII

July 1919

NUMBER 3

## STUDIES IN BALZAC

### III. HIS GENERAL METHOD<sup>1</sup>

Probably the most severe indictment ever penned against the author of the *Comédie humaine* is that, if Parisian society were half as bad as he represents, it must long ago have ceased to exist.<sup>2</sup> But Paris is still there—and so is the *Comédie humaine*. The indictment mentioned is simply one variation of the usual Anglo-Saxon protest against the depiction—with a certain artistic heightening—of malodorous or sinister realities. I say “artistic” designedly, knowing well that many people see in Balzac only a clouded mirror of “the flux,” a world that is without form and frequently void. Yet it is possible to demonstrate that in technique at least the Frenchman knew perfectly well what he was about.

The present writer has believed for some time that the apparent naturalistic welter of Balzac really flows along lines of a set pattern. As in Mr. James’s story, there is a “figure in the carpet,” though here the design is not so recondite. Above all other novelists, Balzac created his own world—or half-world—and culminating in his own *recherche de l’absolu*, he has his own cosmology. We can trace the lines of this through people and landscapes, slums and *châteaux* and whole sociologies, to an apex whose vertiginous lure I will not anticipate. To his uncanny force and knowledge, Honoré de Balzac

<sup>1</sup> Previous studies in this series can be found in *Modern Philology*, August, 1915, and November, 1918.

<sup>2</sup> L. Stephen, *Hours in a Library* (2d ed.), I, 299–348.

certainly adds conscious method, and the two mainsprings of his method are *accumulation* and *harmony*.

In description, character, and plot the novelist accumulates his points along a given line; everywhere he harmonizes his data to accord with a definite keynote, a central unifying trait. Let us choose, in each field, a few instances out of hundreds.

With regard to the description of persons, M. Emile Faguet<sup>1</sup> has recently shown how the denizens of the famous *pension* in *Le Père Goriot* are described in terms of one main characteristic, reinforced by the mass of the details. For example: the villain Vautrin is a sinister (*inquiétant*) individual, as evidenced by his disturbing gaiety, his strength, his familiarity with locks and with women, his penetrating and profound gaze. Old Goriot himself, the modern Lear, is the incarnation of "moral and physical wretchedness," which formula is concretely detailed through several pages: it is also, incidentally, the commonest keynote, whether for persons or places, in the *Comédie humaine*.

Similar illustrations of cumulative harmony, in personal description, may be found in every Balzacian novel. César Birotteau is throughout a large, naïve, sanguine son of a peasant. His physique and costume are presented in terms of size, from his abundant head of hair, through his big back, to his coarse extremities—and even to those of his daughter. "The costume he had adopted *agreed with* his manners and physiognomy"; size is still the keynote, and his large white muslin cravat is the characteristic detail. The miser, Gobseck, is on the other hand appropriately done in shades of reduction and smallness; lips, eyes, hair, and voice are consistently lessened, while his nose glides away almost to a vanishing-point; his speech, his apartment, and his actions are cautiously narrowed and controlled. Madame de Mortsauf, in *Le Lys dans la vallée*, is, like that lily, symbolically white in person and in costume; the word *blanche* is repeated not unlike a Wagnerian *motif*.

One special feature of this synthesizing which well illustrates the author's conscious purpose is the use of what may be called animalism. In his *Avant-propos*, Balzac semi-scientifically stressed the analogies which he saw between people and animals, but the extent to which

<sup>1</sup> Balzac (Grands Écrivains Français), 1913.

he carried this idea into practice has hardly been sufficiently observed. For instance, Marche-à-Terre, the Breton peasant in *Les Chouans*, is spoken of some fifty times as a kind of animal; and the madwoman in *Adieu*, reverting to nature, is again and again likened to bird or beast—over a dozen times in all. There are cases where this kind of keynote is made the dominant of an entire story. *Une Passion dans le désert* reposes for its whole cumulative effect on the sustained and jarring metaphor by which a panther is throughout presented as a woman.

Similarly, *Le Colonel Chabert* offers, though not in the direction of animalism, another case of a sustained keynote, which, proceeding from personal description, dominates a character as well as a story. Perhaps here it will be best to show how the details mass, item by item, before the reader's eyes. It is the Enoch Arden type of story, with the difference that the unscrupulous wife will not acknowledge the returning soldier as her husband.

The very first sentence—"Allons, encore notre vieux carrick!"—indicates that the colonel wears an old-fashioned cloak. Before the clerks of the lawyer Derville, he has a humility of gesture, a forced smile which fades away, and his mien is regularly qualified as "impassive, immobile." One of the clerks significantly remarks that "he looks like a corpse," and another says that he has a *fameux crâne*, which is either skull or headpiece. In response to the question, "Are you the colonel who died at Eylau?" Chabert answers: "The same."

At the lawyer's house the old soldier again evinces that stupidity of expression, that immobility which completes the *ensemble* of a *spectacle surnaturel*. His description includes a lean figure, a mysterious brow, a glazed eye, a livid countenance which "seemed dead." His body is partly in the shadow, producing the effect of a silhouette, together with a total absence of color, movement, warmth. His mutilated skull suggests that his brain escaped through the scar, and again he answers that he is "the man who died at Eylau."

All this indicates the keynote of the colonel. He is a *revenant* in both senses—a ghost who presently admits to his wife that it was a mistake to come back. The later action of the story reinforces this idea of a man who is now inept for life. In spite of a momentary

flicker induced by the lawyer's encouragement, he shows in his submission to his wife's wiles, his sequestration, his subsequent misfortunes and imbecility, an increasing fecklessness and estrangement from the ways of the world. The conclusion is identical with Der-ville's suggestion: "Let him stay dead!"

Balzac's descriptions of place often develop similarly from a definite central idea. Repeated illustrations can be found in any story. The atmosphere of mystery in *La grande Bretèche*—a companion piece to Poe's *Cask of Amontillado*—of ruin in the castle of La Vivetière, of "loudness" in the red parlor of the Rogrons, of meanness in the yellow parlor of Mlle Gamard, are cases in point; in each the items are co-ordinated to one clear result. There is the wistful charm of the Loire Valley, always described as the proper setting for its lily. There is the description of the Pons collection around the keynote of magnificence. There is the note of disorder, as frequently found in the offices of lawyers and the like. In such passages, *résumés*, repetitions of the motive and of appropriate adjectives are cannily used to drive the point home. Between places, as between persons, the device of set contrast is not uncommon.

The treatment of character in the large moves along the line chosen for the physical portrait. The latter is usually made the basis for an elaborate scaffolding of moral and environmental data, all piled up according to one principle of ruling symmetry. No expressions occur more often in Balzac than the phrase *en harmonie* and the verb *s'accorder*. The details of Madame Vauquer's person "are in harmony with that dining-room which oozes misfortune." The atmosphere of her boarding-house is denoted by the repetition of such words as *malheurs* and *misère*, which recur throughout, just as "blood" and "fear" form the scarlet thread that runs through *Macbeth*. Therefore the mistress is made to "explain the *pension*, as the *pension* implies her person." Her old woolen skirt sums up the various rooms, "announces the kitchen, and gives you a guess at the boarders." French logic will not shrink before this Ultima Thule of ratiocination. Workings of the same spirit can be found in Boileau, in Voltaire, and especially in Hippolyte Taine.

The latter's great article on Balzac (1858)<sup>1</sup> has been a main factor in the fame of both men, partly because Taine's own method would

<sup>1</sup> Republished in the *Nouveaux Essais de critique et d'histoire*, 1865.



dispose him to the appreciation of Balzac's. The historian accumulates his points in a definite direction, uses his conclusion as *motif*, and parallels the keynote in character by what he calls the *faculté maitresse* of a man or period. The objections to such systematizing have been abundantly made; just here we are interested rather in the critic's account of the novelist's procedure. He began, says Taine, not like an artist, but like a *savant*. Balzac would first examine and record all externals: the character's town, his street, and his house; the façade, structure and general appearance of the house would come next; then the distribution of apartments, with the furniture and finishing of various rooms. The clothes of each character would be detailed in connection with his anatomy, we are told the size and appearance of each feature, and the total effect is substantiated by individual gestures and marks. The history of a person would include his origin, ideas, habits, particularly his financial position; we learn his *milieu* and his tastes. Then only, after indorsing the reports of many specialists, did the scrupulous artist let his imagination take fire from the mass of documents.

There may be two opinions as to where the creative fire began with Balzac, but there can be no doubt as to the "incomparable solidity" attained by this progression. The exposition of *Le Père Goriot* falls mainly in the line of the above analysis, and still more evidently does *Eugénie Grandet*, which, point by point, might have served as Taine's model. In this novel the general keynote is melancholy, starting in the streets of Saumur, passing through Grandet's house, ending in the heart of Eugénie. The intensive force of the method, its *vraisemblance* rather than its whole truth, constitutes its justification; also it is only by some such natural selection that the characters can be made to rise up above the mass of their material surroundings.

More in detail, one may see the harmonizing and accumulative process applied to a person's name, to his dress and physique, to his gestures, voice and speech, to every *tic* and "gag," and usually to his psychology and actions, if he be truly alive.

As to names, César Birotteau is so called because his first name implies his *grandeur et décadence* and his last name is connotative of his character. Grandet means the "little great man." In *Le Curé de Tours*, Balzac discusses the name of the Marquise de Listomère, whose

suggestive syllables he would have accord with Sterne's *cognomologie*. There is a whole group of people whose names end in "ot," and these are generally of the Parisian *bourgeoisie*, of definite pursuits and standing.

As regards costume, apart from Chabert's *carrick*, we have the case of one old woman's plumes, her *barbes*, which serve to express her would-be stateliness. The *spencer* of Cousin Pons gives us at once his keynote; he, like the colonel, wears an old-fashioned coat because he is an *homme-empire*, out of date, doomed to misfortune.

The matter of gestures, looks, physiognomy, is to Balzac of paramount importance. Inspired by Gall and Lavater,<sup>1</sup> he consistently makes every physical attribute revealing. The accumulation of significant gestures in the *Comédie humaine* would astound a Neapolitan. Whether from vivacious southerners or languid ladies, they have a wealth of specific meaning. "Un de ces regards" is a favorite phrase. The penetrating glance of Vautrin or of Gobseck is mentioned over and over to express the character and impress the beholder. The exchange of glances is frequently the *coup de foudre*, which starts love at first sight. The stoical mask of such an old Roman as Pillerault is no less informing than the yellow bilious complexions of half a dozen villains. The acme of this process seems to be reached when the short thick neck of Michu, in *Une Ténébreuse affaire*, is made prophetic of the guillotine.

The *tic*, or small physical mania, and the "gag," used quite in the manner of Dickens, are similarly employed and multiplied. The childishly vain César perpetually rises on tiptoe and repeats his phrase about the Legion of Honor and the steps of Saint-Roch; while Crevel, the old dandy, strikes his Napoleonic pose throughout *La Cousine Bette*. Grandet has a habit of stammering, not as an infirmity, but in order to practice on the infirmities of others and make them impatiently commit themselves. A like purpose is served by the Alsatian French of the banker Nucingen. The whole speech of such a woman of the people as Madame Cibot is redolent of character, as is the boisterous lingo of such a drummer as Gaudissart, a type which Balzac particularly affected.

<sup>1</sup> F. Baldensperger, *Etudes d'histoire littéraire*, II, 1910.

The frank direct soldier type is another of his favorites. This kind is thoroughly harmonized, whether his name be Hulot, Chabert, or Genestas, and his language is always illuminating. It is picturesque and figurative, and the figures of speech, as also with Balzac's peasants, are suitable to the calling concerned. In *Les Chouans*, the slang of the soldiers abounds in animal metaphors, of which there is a deliberate accumulation.

The careers of most characters, it has already been suggested, will issue logically from the preliminary data. François Birotteau, that lightweight of Tours, is introduced to us in terms of his small material preoccupations, and his rise and fall depend wholly upon the coupling of these with his family trait of naïveté. Michu and Nanon are carefully prepared as specimens of faithful service; the rest of their fictional existence is, in each case, one long devotion. Cousin Bette fulfils the requirements of her nature as a revengeful peasant, and Rubempré those of his education as a spoiled youth.

A character in action is of course an essential part of the plot and the two in alliance furnish the best examples of the cumulative process. Tap upon tap the Balzacian plot is driven to its conclusion, which is often enforced by a last resounding blow, a final turn of the screw. The "taps" are variously expressed: by accretion of character items, by significant *mots de caractère* or pregnant sayings, by the piling up of deeds, of money, of people. Such architectonics can also be seen in part of a plot, for example, a busy day of César Birotteau or of Lucien de Rubempré, where enterprises, financial or Bohemian, are pyramided through dealings with an Indian file of people. But the most striking cases are those where Balzac uses throughout a story either a monomaniac character or a plot of martyrdom.

To take the monomaniacs first, these supermen or "monsters" have incurred much critical comment, and Taine gives a list which comprises Claës, the Baron Hulot, Grandet, Goriot, Frenhofer, Gambara, etc. What has been less noted is the way in which every ruling passion piles up its manifestations to what seems almost an impossible height. Take for instance the miser Grandet. Apart from the exposition which catalogues every phase of his background and personality, apart from the fact that the women are mainly

recorded as reflections of the plethora of his power, one may, in the more vital action, select a series of "taps," deliberately driving home the iron nail that is Grandet.

The first might be the salient trait of his "atrocious" and inoperative pity for Nanon. The second is where he warns Cruchot about selling his wine, "in a tone which made the President shudder." The horror of his heartlessness increases through the scene where, with a banal remark, he carefully folds up the letter telling of his brother's suicide. A newspaper account of this is submitted to him, and he freezes Cruchot again by saying that he already knew about it. Madame Grandet pities Charles, the suicide's son, and cries: "The poor young man!" "Yes, poor," says Old Grandet, "he hasn't a cent." This is almost a *mot de caractère* and clearly we have that device in the next hard tap where the miser tells Charles that death is nothing, disgrace is nothing, the important thing is that "you are without money"—and then mutters to Eugénie: "Ce jeune homme n'est bon à rien, il s'occupe plus des morts que de l'argent."

Eugénie is horrified and begins to judge her father from that moment; this illustrates the favorite *procédé* of emphasizing a tap by its effect. Grandet presently blasphemes against the "bon Dieu" of his wife. He makes an outrageous scene when he learns that Eugénie has parted with her gold. When Madame Grandet is at death's door, her husband wants to know what the drugs will cost. His own death, as often, displays the ruling passion with the effect that I have termed the last turn of the screw. One seems to have reached the limit and yet an added grimness is attained when Grandet avariciously clutches at his bed covering and tries, in extreme unction, to seize the gilded crucifix of the priest. Truly as he had told Eugénie, "la vie est une affaire."

A similar wringing of the last drop from death scenes is to be found in the finish of nearly all Balzac's martyrs. Deathbeds are frequently the *dénouements* in this essentially dramatic progression.

Plots that pile up the money interest are, of course, common enough. *César Birotteau* is one of the most symmetrical illustrations, since the growing expenses of that hero's *grandeur* are closely paralleled by the successive discomfitures, particularly the presentation of bills, in his *décadence*. This rise-and-fall plot, by the way, is found in

Balzac since the early *Scènes de la vie privée*. A financial case more nearly allied with the development of character is that of Balthazar Claës in the *Recherche de l'absolu*.

Claës is a monomaniac, though not of the baser sort. He is a monomaniac of genius, like Gambara the musician and Frenhofer the artist. Whether excesses spring from genius or vice, observes Balzac, the effect on one's family is much the same, and that is what Balthazar's search for the chemical absolute is made to illustrate. It is scarcely necessary to set down the taps in detail. They begin with the savant's fits of absent-mindedness, which suggest his keynote; they take form in an increasing neglect of his family, of which the crowning instance and the great *mot* is his reproach to his half-killed wife—"I was about to decompose nitrogen"; they are made financially concrete by the mention, bill after bill, of what his chemistry cost him—and these taps are really the vertebrae of the plot; finally the deterioration of his physique, his character, and his household are marked by similar and corresponding stages.

Baron Hulot and Cousin Pons are also monomaniacs; the book named after the last character portrays in fact an army of types, each obsessed by his or her fixed idea. The taps by which the action develops take the form of fresh alignments of people, a series of mistresses for Baron Hulot, of persecutors for Cousin Pons. The latter, when he calls at Madame Camusot's house, is badly treated by that lady, by her daughter, by her companions, and by her servants. When he meets his superior relatives on the boulevards, he is cut or berated by one after another. Taking to bed as a consequence of this, he is assailed by the prowling jackals of the quarter—*concierge*, *shyster*, doctor, Jew—who are presented *seriatim*, then in combined attack.

*La Peau de chagrin* furnishes an obvious example of concrete taps, since the plot concerns the shrinking of the talisman every time its possessor makes a wish. He too is a kind of excessive superman, for his repeated keynote is an imperious imagination, romantic and voluptuous. The turn of the screw here is a loathly struggle between love and death. The character of Rastignac, in *Le Père Goriot*, also develops concretely from his initial description as an ambitious Méridional. Thereafter his social rise is given in stages of

money, luxury, dress, carriages, women of fashion. One may count some forty distinct moves in the game, concluding with Rastignac's melodramatic defiance to Paris from the tomb of Goriot. His passionate pride impels him over each difficulty and the gloomy background of the *pension* sets off his successes. On the other hand, Goriot's repeated losses and donations of money, corresponding with his physical break-up and his "hard mounting of other people's stairs"—even to the garret—are in fact so many regular steps downward.

His case brings us to a consideration of the plots of martyrdom. This kind is complicated with the type of the conspiracy-novel, a frequent Balzacian form. The persecution of Cousin Pons, as already outlined, is a capital instance. Others are found in *Le Curé de Tours*, *Pierrette*, and *Le Colonel Chabert*. Martyrs mainly self-impelled are Goriot, Véronique in *Le Curé de village*, and Madame de Mortsauf in *Le Lys dans la vallée*. In nearly all the above, the suffering victim is done to death by successive people or circumstances, plus temperament, and the actual deaths are vividly detailed as so many turns of the screw for final effect. *Pierrette* may be cited as a very complete and typical case.

In this story, Balzac himself skeletonizes for us the three main phases in the victimizing of the girl: the first months of her stay with her mean relatives, who are keynoted as mechanical people with an ugly acquisitiveness; the era of small persecutions and restrictions; the final phase of active physical and moral torture, culminating with her death. The teapot-tempest intrigues of the village work toward the same martyrizing end. The whole plot, item after item, amounts to a search for instances of persecution. Finally, *Pierrette* is actually disinterred in order that the autopsy may establish the nature of her wounds and justify her relatives.

A Balzacian plot is not always of this simple character, but more often than not it is a question of repeated blows in one or more directions. The plot may be double, as in the rise-and-fall type already mentioned, or as in the conflict type. In the latter case—*Les Chouans*, *Le Lys dans la vallée*—there will be rival interests, each of which demands its detailed exploitation.

In the principal elements of his fiction, then—detail, description, characterization, plot—it is seen that Balzac, as a rule, accumulates



and co-ordinates, from a given point, along a given line. His clumsy style shows the effect of this accumulation; the tripartite sentence is not infrequent and the habit of amassing details produces at times almost a Rabelaisian catalogue effect.

The further question is: Does a like accumulation appear in the wider aspects of his work—his sociology and his general ideas? Here the field is too broad to allow more than a few general hints.

It is evident that, according to his manifesto in the *Avant-propos*, he intends to be the "secretary of society," which he holds to consist of "men, women, and things." That his attention to things, materialistic as it may be, is often an organic part of his work has been sufficiently stressed. Hence obviously a large part of his descriptions of furniture, costumes, places: they are harmonized around a common keynote. But material objects are also developed for their own sake. Hence the importance given to things as pivots in the plot: the costume of Rastignac or of Vandenesse, the crucifix in *La grande Bretèche*, the musical instruments of Gambara, the fan as a symbol of the great lady. In love affairs, flowers are emphasized as the material symbol, and the collection of Cousin Pons is made a protagonist in the drama, in a manner recalling Hugo's vivification of Notre-Dame, Zola's pet procedure, and Hardy's Egdon Heath.

The men and women, forming the rest of society, are largely distributed into types. What Balzac thought his great discovery, though Diderot partly anticipated him, was that humanity, like animal zoölogy, has its species, divisible according to profession and habitat. A consideration merely of his titles will show that some thirty stories are announced as sociological studies—*Etudes de mœurs*, as he called them. Such titles indicate either a social category, a social institution or a social stage, and they may be divided into these three groups. In the first group may be listed: *La Femme de trente ans*, *Le Curé de village*, *Le Médecin de campagne*, *Les Parents pauvres*; in the second, *Le Bal de Sceaux*, *Le Contrat de mariage*, *Le Cabinet des antiques*, *La Maison Nucingen*; in the third, *Un Début dans la vie*, *Mémoires de deux jeunes mariées*, etc.

Each of these stories largely fulfils the promise of its title and furthermore many others might be given similar titles: for instance, *La Maison Claës*, *La Maison Vauquer*, and perhaps even *La Maison*



*Grandet*. It will readily be seen that Balzac is primarily occupied with classes of society, as Molière was before him. If it be asked whether this French tendency to universalize hurts the individualities of the *Comédie humaine*, I think the answer will generally be in the negative. They are too thoroughly worked out, in both directions, for any such weakness. The miser type appears in *Grandet*, *Gobseck*, *Graslin*, etc., but surely *Grandet* and *Gobseck* are none the less individual. There are several individual old maids, but they agree in certain common marks of the type, and the type, as seen by many side remarks, is Balzac's constant preoccupation.

Finally, in the realm of general ideas, how does this writer collect and master his world? There are three main ideals which he is continually applying: the family, the monarchy, and the church. The early *Scènes de la vie privée* chiefly record the romances and misfortunes of young people who leave the parental wing and go out of their class to marry. The decay of the monarchy is in Balzac's mind the cause of much latter-day mediocrity and confusion. The church is still the center of morality and spirituality. His modern *Inferno*, curiously enough, was still to be dominated by the ruling ideas of Dante's; and enough has been suggested to indicate that Balzac's shaping mind sought to impose an order, not infrequently artificial, upon his naturalistic chaos.

E. PRESTON DARGAN

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

[To be continued]

## THE SOURCES OF ROUSSEAU'S EDOUARD BOMSTON

A study of the sources which aided Rousseau to portray in the *Nouvelle Héloïse*<sup>1</sup> the Englishman, Lord Edouard Bomston, leads to an inquiry as to the author's attitude toward England and the manner in which his conception of English character was formed. To the first of these questions Rousseau himself offers answers, characteristic in their contradictions. "Je n'ai jamais aimé l'Angleterre ni les Anglois," he wrote in the *Confessions* for the year 1762;<sup>2</sup> and for 1765 is this other similar passage: "Je n'avois pas naturellement de penchant pour l'Angleterre, et ... je ne voulois prendre ce parti [d'y aller] qu'à l'extrémité" (p. 167). On the other hand, he wrote to Mme de Boufflers in the very 1762 just mentioned: "J'ai cent fois désiré et je désire encore voir l'Angleterre."<sup>3</sup> This passage, anterior to the prejudices caused by the unfortunate English journey (1766-67)<sup>4</sup> and by the break with Hume, receives the valuable corroboration of one written much later, after the cooling of those same prejudices permitted a more unbiased viewpoint than is to be found in the *Confessions*, which were written while the disappointments of the English journey were still fresh in his mind. Rousseau wrote: "Choisir un Anglois pour mon dépositaire et mon confident seroit, ce me semble, réparer d'une manière bien authentique le mal que j'ai pu penser et dire de sa nation. On l'a trop abusée sur mon compte pour que j'aie pu ne pas m'abuser quelquefois sur le sien."<sup>5</sup> Were further argument needed to show that it is the two passages last cited which represent Rousseau's real attitude, we should need only to recall his sympathetic treatment of the character of Bomston to be sure that, up to and including the time of composition of the *Nouvelle Héloïse*, Rousseau, far from having an antipathy toward England, viewed it with interest and esteem.

<sup>1</sup> Including also the short additional episode called *Les Amours de Milord Edouard Bomston*.

<sup>2</sup> *Œuvres complètes de J. J. Rousseau* (Paris: Hachette, 1862-64), VI, 132.

<sup>3</sup> Letter of August, 1762; *Œuvres*, VII, 274.

<sup>4</sup> Rousseau left Calais for England January 10, 1766; he arrived at Calais on his return May 22, 1767. Cf. Louis J. Courtois, "Le Séjour de J. J. Rousseau en Angleterre," *Annales J. J. Rousseau*, VI, 13, 95.

<sup>5</sup> *Œuvres*, VI, 237-38, note.

It is interesting, as well as significant, that Rousseau's first great impulse toward study came from a book conceived almost wholly under the inspiration of England, one whose subject in fact was the government, the customs, and the literature of that nation. Curiously enough, the author of the work which thus aroused Rousseau from his lethargy was in later years to be his great opponent in the philosophic movement. Voltaire's *Lettres philosophiques* first appeared in France in the year 1734. Rousseau read them, and from that time his mind was awake and active.<sup>1</sup>

A few years later (1737-41) Rousseau was already pleased to pass himself off as an Englishman.

Je ne sais par quelle bizarrerie je m'avisai de passer pour Anglois; je me donnai pour jacobite, on me prit pour tel; je m'appelai Dudding et l'on m'appela M. Dudding. Un maudit marquis de Torignan qui étoit là, malade ainsi que moi, vieux au par-dessus et d'assez mauvaise humeur, s'avisa de lier conversation avec M. Dudding. Il me parla du roi Jacques, du prétendant, de l'ancienne cour de Saint-Germain. J'étois sur les épines: je ne savais de tout cela que le peu que j'en avois lu dans le comte Hamilton et dans les gazettes; cependant je fis de ce peu si bon usage que je me tirai d'affaire: heureux qu'on ne se fût pas avisé de me questionner sur la langue angloise, dont je ne savais pas un seul mot."<sup>2</sup>

Rousseau had, then, read Hamilton's *Mémoires du chevalier de Grammont*, which were first published anonymously, in 1713. Their account of the court of Charles II seems to have served him a good turn in this instance, though surely it was not much political history that he learned from them. Since at this time he knew no English, of the "gazettes" only the French periodical publications were accessible to him. As an enthusiastic admirer of the novels of the Abbé Prévost,<sup>3</sup> Rousseau may well have been a reader of the former's weekly periodical, *Le Pour et contre*,<sup>4</sup> which was appearing at this time and which gave much space to things English. From it he could have obtained some general knowledge of English character and manners and a slight smattering of English literature, enough

<sup>1</sup> "Rien de tout ce qu'écrivait Voltaire ne nous échappoit. Le goût que je pris à ces lectures m'inspira le désir d'apprendre à écrire avec élégance, et de tâcher à imiter le beau coloris de cet auteur, dont j'étois enchanté. Quelque temps après parurent ses *Lettres philosophiques*. Quoiqu'elles ne soient assurément pas son meilleur ouvrage, ce fut celui qui m'attira le plus vers l'étude, et ce goût naissant ne s'éteignit plus depuis ce temps-là" (*Œuvres*, V, 464-65 [*Confessions*]).

<sup>2</sup> *Œuvres*, V, 490 (*Confessions*).

<sup>3</sup> *Œuvres*, IV, 248 (*Le Verger des charmettes*, 1736); *Œuvres*, V, 469 (*Confessions*).

<sup>4</sup> Paris, 1733-40, twenty vols.

perhaps for the purposes of this embarrassing moment. At this same time the *Bibliothèque britannique*<sup>1</sup> offered similar information, though in rather less interesting form.

A little later during the same period, Rousseau boarded at Montpellier with an Irish doctor named Fitz-Moris. There he found several Irish students, from whom he tried to learn some English. Evidently he did not wish again to be caught unprepared. At Venice in 1743-44 he came in contact with Englishmen and found the acquaintance agreeable. They were men of intelligence and passionately fond of music.<sup>2</sup> This last characteristic is one emphasized by Rousseau later in Bomston. It may well be that the germ of the character of Edouard is to be found here in the fond memories which Rousseau preserved for years after and finally noted down in his *Confessions*. It is unfortunate that there are not further details. At Paris not long afterward Rousseau met for the first time the companion of his future years, Thérèse le Vasseur. At the same table were several Irish priests, but Rousseau was not attracted to them.

Rousseau knew Boissy, the author of several comedies, among them *Le François à Londres*, which dates from 1727 and which is distinguished by its favorable attitude toward the English.<sup>3</sup> Whether or not Rousseau had read the play, it is at least possible that he had heard Boissy speak of the English, a subject of increasing interest to the public in general. But this is only a hypothesis and, even if true, would connote but little influence upon Rousseau. With Diderot, however, we come to a man big in his century and big also in the life of Jean-Jacques. His importance, especially from the point of view of contact with England, is emphasized by Joseph Texte in these terms: "Diderot, dont Rousseau avait fait la connaissance dès sa première arrivée à Paris, en 1741, resta pendant seize années—les années décisives de la vie de Jean-Jacques, celles de l'élaboration des chefs-d'œuvre—son confident littéraire. . . . Or—peut-être ne l'a-t-on pas assez noté—de tous les écrivains du dix-huitième siècle, Diderot est le plus curieux de littérature étrangère,

<sup>1</sup> La Haye, 1733-47, twenty-five vols.

<sup>2</sup> *Œuvres*, V, 496, 534, and 546 (*Confessions*).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. C. F. Zeek, Jr., *Louis de Boissy* (Grenoble, 1914); *Confessions*.

et spécialement anglaise. Il est 'tout anglais,' a écrit excellemment M. Brunetière (*Epoques du théâtre français*, p. 295).<sup>1</sup> The absoluteness of this pronouncement should perhaps be somewhat modified,<sup>2</sup> but its essential truthfulness remains. Diderot translated Shaftesbury, read Mandeville, even his *Encyclopédie* owes its origin to Chambers' *Dictionary*. In his drama Diderot was influenced by Lillo and by Moore, in his novel by Richardson and by Sterne. Hume and other Englishmen were among his friends.<sup>3</sup> We can, therefore, be very sure that Rousseau had with Diderot many a conversation which turned upon England or the English, but the amount of Diderot's contribution must remain uncertain. We can hardly doubt that, in view of his great intimacy with Jean-Jacques, this influence must have been considerable.

Rousseau was intimate also with the Abbé Prévost, one of the few acquaintances whom he praises highly and whom he places at the head of the "amis d'élite," who met at the home of his relative Mussard. Rousseau calls Prévost "un homme très-aimable et très-simple, dont le cœur vivifioit ses écrits, dignes de l'immortalité, et qui n'avoit rien dans l'humeur ni dans la société du sombre coloris qu'il donnoit à ses ouvrages."<sup>4</sup> This passage treats of the period 1750-51, when Prévost had already written the *Mémoires et aventures d'un homme de qualité*, which contains interesting remarks on England; *Cléveland*, whose hero is an Englishman; *Le Pour et contre*, a periodical which made a speciality of catering to the growing Anglo-mania; the *Doyen de Killerine*, whose hero is an Irish priest; and, among others of lesser importance which need not be mentioned, the *Mémoires de M. de Montcal*, the scene of which is laid in England and Ireland. Already also Prévost was the translator of Richardson's *Pamela* and was about to publish *Clarissa Harlowe* (1751). How great is the importance of England in the work of the Abbé Prévost is thus evident. Since Rousseau came in contact with Richardson through Prévost's translations and since he held the Abbé personally in such esteem, it is hardly to be doubted that the two must have

<sup>1</sup> Joseph Texte, *J. J. Rousseau et les origines du cosmopolitisme littéraire* (Paris, 1895), p. 133.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Loyalty Cru, *Diderot and English Thought* (New York, 1913).

<sup>3</sup> Texte, *op. cit.*, p. 135.

<sup>4</sup> *Œuvres*, V, 578 (*Confessions*).

often talked together of the country and the people across the channel. Prévost was a charming companion, courteous and moderate in the expression of opinion, an intelligent and fair-minded, if not a profound, observer; his words could not fail to attract and to impress. Moreover, we know that Rousseau had been profoundly affected by the reading of *Cléveland* of which he wrote, in the *Confessions*, as follows: "La lecture des malheurs imaginaires de Cléveland, faite avec fureur et souvent interrompue, m'a fait faire, je crois, plus de mauvais sang que les miens" (p. 469). Something of the character of *Cléveland* has, in fact, passed into that of Edouard Bomston, but of this we shall have more to say later.

In Rousseau's reading we find as representative of English literature: Addison's *Spectator*,<sup>1</sup> Locke's *Essay*,<sup>2</sup> Samuel Clarke,<sup>3</sup> Richardson,<sup>4</sup> Pope,<sup>5</sup> Lillo's *London Merchant*,<sup>6</sup> the less-known *Oroonoko* by Southerne,<sup>7</sup> probably Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe*,<sup>8</sup> and something perhaps of Milton,<sup>9</sup> familiar to him were also the names at least—and perhaps more—of Barclay,<sup>10</sup> Newton,<sup>11</sup> and Dryden.<sup>12</sup> This list gives an idea of what he had read up to the time when the *Nouvelle Héloïse* was written. In general he did not go farther than most of the cultivated public of the time. His interest in English literature and his knowledge of it are, however, evidently such as to show that he was far from being hostile to the spread of English ideas, much as some passages of his might make us think the contrary.

An illuminating comment is the following: "L'Anglois ne va guère demander aux autres l'hospitalité qu'il leur refuse chez lui. Dans quelle cour, hors celle de Londres, voit-on ramper lâchement

<sup>1</sup> "Le Spectateur surtout me plut beaucoup, et me fit du bien" (*ibid.*, p. 389).

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 481. Cf. also *Œuvres*, IV, 271 (*Le Verger des charmettes*).

<sup>3</sup> *Œuvres*, II, 59-60 (*Emile*).

<sup>4</sup> *Œuvres*, III, 351, note (*Nouvelle Héloïse*).

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 295, 310.

<sup>6</sup> Rousseau calls Lillo's play "une pièce admirable, et dont la morale va plus directement au but qu'aucune pièce française que je connoisse" (*Œuvres*, I, 215, note [*Lettre à D'Alembert*, etc.]).

<sup>7</sup> *Œuvres*, VI, 112 (*Confessions*).

<sup>8</sup> Rousseau calls himself "un nouveau Robinson" (*Œuvres*, V, 521 [*Confessions*]). As Defoe's novel was much read in France, it is probable that Rousseau's knowledge was at first hand.

<sup>9</sup> *Œuvres*, II, 216 (*Emile*).

<sup>10</sup> *Œuvres*, IV, 248 (*Le Verger des charmettes*).

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 247.

<sup>12</sup> *Œuvres*, I, 50, note (*Réponse à M. Bordes*).

ces fiers insulaires? Dans quel pays, hors le leur, vont-ils chercher à s'enrichir? Ils sont durs, il est vrai; cette dureté ne me déplaît pas quand elle marche avec la justice. Je trouve beau qu'ils ne soient qu'Anglois, puisqu'ils n'ont pas besoin d'être hommes."<sup>1</sup> For a man who had "never loved either England or the English" the tone of this passage indicates rather strong admiration. Yet Texte seems to go too far when he says that the excuse for the praise that Edouard lavishes upon his country lies in the fact that "c'est Jean-Jacques qui parle par sa bouche et qui lui fait dire toutes ces belles choses."<sup>2</sup> When, for instance, Edouard calls the English "la seule nation d'hommes qui reste parmi les troupeaux divers dont la terre est couverte"<sup>3</sup> he is completely in character and merely bears out the current idea of the period that Englishmen were extremely chauvinistic. Rousseau himself puts us on our guard with the statement that Edouard has "une étrange prévention pour son pays."<sup>4</sup> Moreover, even before the unfortunate English journey, Rousseau admired only with certain important reservations. This is made clear by two passages which date from 1762, one from *Emile*, the other from the *Contrat social*. Rousseau says: "Je sais que les Anglois vantent beaucoup leur humanité et le bon naturel de leur nation, qu'ils appellent *good naturel people*; mais ils ont beau crier cela tant qu'ils peuvent, personne ne le répète après eux."<sup>5</sup> The second passage reads: "Le peuple anglois pense être libre, il se trompe fort; il ne l'est que durant l'élection des membres du parlement; sitôt qu'ils sont élus, il est esclave, il n'est rien. Dans les courts momens de sa liberté, l'usage qu'il en fait mérite bien qu'il la perde."<sup>6</sup> It is evident that one must be careful not to overestimate the degree of Rousseau's admiration for England; we can, however, be sure that, shifting and changing with the whims and prejudices of the moment, this admiration did nevertheless exist in him, not only before, but also after the English journey.

But if Rousseau learned much about the English from the conversations of his friends and acquaintances, if he received perhaps

<sup>1</sup> *Œuvres*, III, 263, note (*Nouvelle Héloïse*).

<sup>2</sup> Texte, *op. cit.*, pp. 130-31.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 124 (from Rousseau, *Œuvres*, III, 482).

<sup>4</sup> *Œuvres*, III, 263, note 1 (*Nouvelle Héloïse*).

<sup>5</sup> *Œuvres*, I, 533, note (*Emile*).

<sup>6</sup> *Œuvres*, II, 633 (*Contrat social*).



even more influence from the atmosphere of Anglomania which had existed in France increasingly for the last thirty years, yet it is no less true that the conception of the character of Lord Edouard Bomston is due primarily to two sources. These two sources are the Abbé Prévost's *Cléveland*, to which reference has already been made, and the *Lettres sur les Anglois et sur les François* written about 1695 by the Swiss, Bénédict Louis de Muret, but not published till 1725.

We have referred to the deep impression made upon Rousseau by *Cléveland*.<sup>1</sup> "La lecture des malheurs imaginaires de Cléveland, faite avec fureur et souvent interrompue, m'a fait faire, je crois, plus de mauvais sang que les miens."<sup>2</sup> The memory of the character of Cléveland lingered long with Rousseau. Prévost's hero has, in accord with Jean-Jacques' ideal, contributed doubtless even to form it, and thus furnished Rousseau, probably quite without his knowing it, the general conception of a man who believes himself a philosopher, but who in reality is guided by his *âme sensible* rather than by his reason. Notice the numerous points of similarity between Cléveland and Bomston. The two dominant characteristics of both are that they are *vertueux* and *sensible*.

## CLÉVELAND

"Mon cœur a toujours suivi par inclination la vertu et la sagesse"  
(V, 430-31).<sup>3</sup>

"Un cœur infiniment sensible"  
(V, 361).

"Le cœur le plus tendre et le plus sensible que la nature ait formé"  
(VI, 25).<sup>4</sup>

## BOMSTON

"Les principes stoïques de ce vertueux Anglois" (III, 640).<sup>4</sup>

"Au plus vertueux des hommes"  
(III, 264).<sup>5</sup>

"On dit, milord, que vous avez l'âme belle et le cœur sensible"  
(NH [= *Nouvelle Héloïse*], III, 225).

"Il avoit l'âme sensible" (*ibid.*, III, 200).

"Un homme sensible" (*ibid.*, III, 239).

<sup>1</sup> *Le Philosophe anglois, ou Histoire de Monsieur Cléveland, fils naturel de Cromwell*, 1731-39. Œuvres choisies de Prévost, Vols. IV-VII (Paris, 1810-16).

<sup>2</sup> Rousseau, *Œuvres*, V, 469 (*Confessions*).

<sup>3</sup> Prévost, *Cléveland*, V, 430-31.

<sup>4</sup> Rousseau, *Œuvres*, III, 640 (*Amours de Milord Edouard*). The Roman numeral indicates the volume of Rousseau's *Œuvres*, and not a part of the individual work.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. III, 200, 227-28 (*Nouvelle Héloïse*), pp. 642, 648 (*Amours*).

<sup>6</sup> Cf. *ibid.*, p. 126, and C (= *Cléveland*), IV, 68, 139, 185-86, 223, 224, 233; V, 59, 92, 122, 520, 527, 586; VI, 38, 329; VII, 403.

Other characteristics common to both are strength, tempered by weakness due to the overmastering power of the emotions; frankness and sincerity; ardor; the possession of strong passions; eagerness to seem *philosophes*; a certain lack of polish in manners, which in Cléveland is later removed by contact with society; a strong sense of duty; and finally, a feeling of being unique or extraordinary, set apart from other men by their virtue and by their sensibility.

## CLÉVELAND

## BOMSTON

*Strength*

"La résolution que je pris donc en ce moment de me rendre maître de tous les témoignages extérieurs de ma peine devint une règle que j'ai suivie depuis avec une incroyable constance" (V, 190).<sup>1</sup>

"Vertueux et ferme" (NH, III, 200).

"Il me paroissoit avoir l'âme grande et forte" (III, 201).

"Il demeura ferme; il l'avoit promis" (A [= *Amours*], III, 646).

*Emotional Weakness*

"Si je suis foible par quelque endroit, c'est par le cœur" (V, 88).

"Tel étoit l'excès de ma foiblesse: j'étois le jouet de l'amour et de mon propre cœur" (V, 590).

"Son cœur, épuisé par tant de combats, s'est trouvé dans un état de foiblesse dont elle [Laure] a profité" (NH, III, 553).

"Il passa plusieurs années ainsi partagé entre deux maîtresses; flottant sans cesse de l'une à l'autre; souvent voulant renoncer à toutes deux et n'en pouvant quitter aucune" (A, III, 647).

*Frankness*

"Ma franchise ordinaire" (IV, 196).

"Je n'ai point honte de me laisser voir tel que je suis au public, et de lui faire l'aveu ingénu de mes fautes" (V, 430).

"Ne leur cachez rien de ce qui fait honneur à mon digne ami, même à mes dépens" (NH, III, 575).

*Ardor and Passion*

"Une ardeur que nul autre que moi n'a jamais sentie" (V, 63).

"Edouard pénétré se livroit à ses transports; son âme émue et sensible

<sup>1</sup> Cf., IV, 149, 179; V, 36, 274, 276, 363, 398.

## CLÉVELAND

"J'étois tendre et passionné"  
(V, 92).

*"Philosophes"*

"J'ai tiré en effet de la philosophie  
tout le secours qu'elle peut donner"  
(IV, 234).

"Je m'étois cru philosophe" (V,  
422; cf. p. 489).

*Bad Manners*

"Mes manières simples, et peut-  
être un peu grossières" (IV, 118).

"J'apprenois à monter à cheval et  
à me servir de diverses armes; je  
me formois à la bonne grâce du  
corps; je devenois civil, prévenant,  
attentif à obliger" (IV, 135).

*Strong Sense of Duty*

"C'étoit assez que j'eusse reconnu  
mon devoir, pour ne pas demeurer un  
moment indéterminé à le suivre"  
(IV, 147).

*Uniqueness*

"Je suis peut-être le seul individu  
de ma malheureuse espèce" (V, 36).

"Non-seulement il ne se trouvera  
personne qui ait senti des maux tels  
que les miens, mais à-peine se  
trouvera-t-il quelqu'un qui les puisse  
comprendre" (V, 190; cf. p. 490,  
and VI, 16).

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 146-47, and C, V, 541.

## BOMSTON

s'exhaloit dans ses regards, dans ses  
gestes; il ne disoit pas un mot qui  
ne fût l'expression de la passion la  
plus vive" (A, III, 641).

"Toujours ardent, vif, passionné"  
(A, III, 647).

"Il se pique de philosophie"  
(NH, III, 200).

"Un homme sensible qui croit  
n'être qu'un philosophe" (*ibid.*, III,  
239).

"C'est le chemin des passions qui  
m'a conduit à la philosophie" (*ibid.*,  
III, 249).

"Il met plus d'énergie que de  
grâce dans ses discours, et je lui  
trouve même l'esprit un peu rêche"  
(*ibid.*, III, 199).

"Un Anglois naturellement peu  
prévenant" (*ibid.*).

"Je sais ce qui convient, m'a-t-il  
dit brusquement" (*ibid.*, III, 225).

"Quoique je n'aie plus aucun  
crédit dans le parlement, il me suffit  
d'en être membre pour faire mon  
devoir jusqu'à la fin" (*ibid.*, III,  
575).<sup>1</sup>

"Une générosité sans exemple"  
(*ibid.*, III, 257).

"Vos vertus héroïques" (*ibid.*).

"Son âme sublime est au-dessus  
de celle des hommes" (*ibid.*, III,  
265).

"Cet homme extraordinaire"  
(*ibid.*, III, 471).

The correspondence in many of the traits of Cléveland and of Bomston is noteworthy, but, striking as it is, it does not necessarily warrant the conclusion that Rousseau consciously set out to imitate Prévost. On the contrary, the fact that the character of Cléveland is portrayed only by slight indications scattered through all the four volumes of the novel would make such servile imitation more difficult and less probable. Moreover, the points of correspondence are characteristics either possessed or admired by Rousseau himself. Some of them, such as *sensiblerie*, lie also in the general trend of the period contemporary with Jean-Jacques. These facts are against any theory of direct imitation of Prévost by Rousseau in this instance. They do not, however, exclude the generally admitted influence of *Cléveland* upon Jean-Jacques, both directly through his reading and indirectly through his milieu. Each reader may determine for himself how much should be attributed to influence of Prévost upon Rousseau and how much to correspondence in the character and ideals of the two authors.

We come now to the other chief source employed by Rousseau, namely, Muralt's *Lettres sur les Anglois et sur les François*.<sup>1</sup> In the *Nouvelle Héloïse* the name of Muralt is mentioned six times;<sup>2</sup> the reason for this is that Rousseau read these *Lettres* during the very period when he was composing his novel,<sup>3</sup> that is to say, toward the end of 1756 or during 1757.<sup>4</sup> It is therefore not strange that Muralt should be fresh in his mind at this time; it is in fact hardly possible

<sup>1</sup> The references *infra* are to the second edition of Muralt's *Lettres* (Cologne, 1727).

<sup>2</sup> Rousseau, *Œuvres*, III, 276, 279, 293, 296, 301, 597.

<sup>3</sup> Rousseau's friend, Alexandre Déleyre, gives us a hint of this in a letter to Rousseau from Paris, November 2, 1756: "Quant aux *Lettres sur les Anglois et sur les François*, je les ai; mais outre qu'elles sont à emprunt, et que je veux les acheter, une page lue me les fait lire toutes, et comme j'ai d'autres envois à vous faire, je partage celui-ci, pour avoir le plaisir de vous écrire deux fois" (G. Streckelsen-Moultou, *Rousseau, ses amis et ses ennemis*, I, 149).

<sup>4</sup> Begun in 1756; Rousseau, *Œuvres*, VI, 23 (*Confessions*). Rousseau says the novel was not finished till the winter of 1758-59 (*ibid.*, p. 74), but elsewhere, in a letter of September 13, 1758, to the publisher Rey, Rousseau declares the work is already finished and in six parts (Streckelsen-Moultou, *op. cit.*). It is, moreover, nearly certain that it was finished even before this date. As early as October 1, 1757, Rousseau wrote to Mme d'Houdetot: "Dès que j'aurai fini ma copie de la *Nouvelle Héloïse*, je commencerai la vôtre." This implies that he was at least approaching the end. Furthermore, on November 30, 1757 he wrote her again to the effect that he was preparing her copy (Buffenoir, *La Comtesse d'Houdetot, sa famille, ses amis*, 1905). It is scarcely probable that the work was then unfinished.

to doubt that Rousseau read him deliberately in order to inform himself more definitely about English character and to be able to give more accuracy to his portrayal of "Milord" Edouard.

Let us compare Muralt's account of English characteristics with Rousseau's description of Bomston.

## MURALT

## BOMSTON

*Generosity*

"L'avarice n'est pas le vice des Anglois, et ils donnent plus volontiers dans l'excès opposé" (p. 18).

Edouard offers a third of his property to Saint-Preux (*NH*, III, 230).

*Bounty*

"De la prospérité, de la magnificence chez les grands" (p. 2).

"Edouard, n'oubliant pas la magnificence anglaise" (*A*, III, 644).

*Frankness*

"Il seroit du moins à souhaiter qu'il y eut de ces Anglois répandus dans le monde pour dire aux hommes les vérités que personne n'ose leur dire" (p. 56).

"Edouard, passant en revue toutes mes fautes, me remit devant les yeux un tableau qui n'étoit pas flatté" (*NH*, III, 547).

*Interest in Humanity*

"J'étois plus curieux d'hommes que de battimens" (p. 99).

"Bientôt je vis avec plaisir que les tableaux et les monumens ne lui avoient point fait négliger l'étude des mœurs et des hommes" (*ibid.*, III, 200).

*Bravery*

"La bravoure des Anglois est établie partout" (p. 4).

"Leur mépris de la mort" (p. 19).

"Imagines-tu le brave Edouard voyant fuir les Anglois, et fuyant lui-même? . . . Jamais, jamais! . . . il se fût fait tuer cent fois" (*ibid.*, III, 563).

*Intellectual*

"Ils aiment à faire usage de leur raison" (p. 9).

Edouard "est plus fort que moi [Saint-Preux] de raisonnement" (*ibid.*, III, 553).

## MURALT

## BOMSTON

*Independence*

"Les Grands tiennent peu à la Cour" (p. 5).

"Les conseils ne peuvent rien sur eux" (p. 19).

"Ils dépendent fort peu du public et ne se laissent guère tyranniser par la coutume" (p. 56).

"Vous savez que la cour ne me [Edouard] convient guère" (*ibid.*, III, 390).

"On ne gagne rien avec lui par les discours" (*ibid.*, III, 553).

"Cet intrépide amour de la vertu, qui lui fait mépriser l'opinion publique" (*ibid.*, III, 122).

*Pride*

"Une espèce de fierté que les gens qui en sont incommodés appellent volontiers insolence" (p. 2).

"Ils ont une fort prévention pour l'excellence de leur nation" (p. 3).

"Un air fier" (*ibid.*, III, 226).

Edouard says of his country: "Passé chez la seule nation d'hommes qui reste parmi les troupeaux divers dont la terre est couverte" (*ibid.*, III, 482).

*Austerity*

"Ils sont un peu durs" (p. 18).

"La dureté philosophique et nationale" (*ibid.*, III, 228).

*Bad Manners*

"La plupart négligent les manières et les agréments; mais ils cultivent la raison" (p. 15).

"Il se pique de philosophie ... il dédaigne les petites bienséances" (*ibid.*, III, 200).

*Lack of Delicacy*

"D'ordinaire le délicat et le naïf leur manquent" (p. 10).

"Dans son intègre probité, Edouard manquoit de délicatesse" (A, III, 644).

*Violence*

"Leur manière violente et emporté" (p. 3).

"Lorsqu'ils deviennent amoureux, c'est avec violence" (p. 42).

"Je le crois vif et emporté" (NH, III, 200).

"Vous connoissez sa violence" (*ibid.*, 553).

"Edouard pénétré se livroit à ses transports; son âme émue et sensible s'exhaloit dans ses regards, dans ses gestes; il ne disoit pas un mot qui ne fût l'expression de la passion la plus vive" (A, III, 641).

## MURALT

## BOMSTON

*Extreme*

"Il me semble que pour l'ordinaire ils ont de grands vertus, ou de grands défauts, et assez souvent l'un et l'autre" (p. 14).

"Ils sont charitables et ils sont cruels" (p. 19).

"Un petit reste de férocité qui est le fond de leur caractère" (p. 19).

"Cet homme . . . extrême et grand en tout" (*ibid.*, III, 640).

"L'humanité naturelle" (*NH*, III, 228).

Brutality with Laure (*A*, III, 642).

*Intemperance*

"Ils boivent comme des Saxons" (p. 19).

"Bomston, à demi ivre" (*NH*, III, 217).

Thus it is evident how great is the correspondence between the character of Muralt's Englishmen and that of Rousseau's Edouard. There is, however, an important characteristic of Bomston which is not to be found already emphasized in Muralt's description. This is "sensibility." It is a trait which derives both from the character of Rousseau himself and from the trend of the century. La Chaussée, Richardson, Diderot, Prévost, and others less prominent, all aided in its development. It is by all means to be expected that Rousseau would make this addition to Muralt's picture of the English. Another important difference is that Muralt portrays the English as really following their reason, while Rousseau's Edouard only imagines he is doing so. In reality he finds the source of all his virtues in his "heart."<sup>1</sup> This we have already found to be a fundamental part of the character of Cléveland. It is also exactly what we might expect in view of the general tendency of Rousseau himself in his later years to oppose the philosophic movement of his time. The virtuous Bomston is a direct and concrete protest against those who wish to enthrone reason in the supreme position.

<sup>1</sup> There is a striking similarity between this important characteristic of Milord Edouard and what Rousseau says is one of the traits of Mme de Warens. "Au lieu d'écouter son cœur, qui la menoit bien, elle écouta sa raison, qui la menoit mal" (*Œuvres* V, 452 [*Confessionnel*]). Of course this indicates merely the primacy accorded by Rousseau to the heart over the reason. Cf. also Rousseau's description of himself as "vrai, maladroit, fier, impatient, emporté" (*Œuvres*, VI, 34). The same adjectives, with perhaps the exception of "maladroit" which is, however, implied in Edouard's lack of tact and finesse, are frequently applied to Bomston.



That Rousseau has described Edouard with such predilection is due also in large part to the fact that at this time Jean-Jacques had almost completed his own successful struggle to win through to the life of virtue. He says:

Jusque-là j'avois été bon: dès lors je devins vertueux, ou du moins enivré de la vertu. Cette ivresse avoit commencé dans ma tête, mais elle avoit passé dans mon cœur. Le plus noble orgueil y germa sur les débris de la vanité déracinée. Je ne jouai rien: je devins en effet tel que je parus; et pendant quatre ans au moins que dura cette effervescence dans toute sa force, rien de grand et de beau ne peut entrer dans un cœur d'homme, dont je ne fusse capable entre le ciel et moi. . . . J'étois vraiment transformé; mes amis, mes connoissances ne me reconnoissoient plus. Je n'étois plus cet homme timide, et plutôt honteux que modeste, qui n'osoit ni se présenter, ni parler; qu'un mot badin déconcertoit, qu'un regard de femme faisoit rougir. Audacieux, fier, intrépide, je portois partout une assurance d'autant plus ferme, qu'elle étoit simple, et résidoit dans mon âme plus que dans mon maintien.<sup>1</sup>

Much of the essential of Edouard's character, in its strength as well as in its weakness, is to be found in the Rousseau of this period, thus swept along by a new-born passionate love for a life of virtue based upon the enthusiasms of a "sensitive" spirit. In Edouard, Rousseau has sounded a glorification, not merely of the English character, but also of the *cœur sensible*.<sup>2</sup>

To sum up: it seems to us that, when Rousseau began to write the *Nouvelle Héloïse*, one of his aims<sup>3</sup> was to apotheosize the virtue so recently won in his own life. Into his character, Edouard Bomston, he put a great deal of himself, but it was a self in general firmer and more energetic, more what he himself would fain be but was not; he chose for this purpose an Englishman, partly because he admired the

<sup>1</sup> *Œuvres*, VI, 12 (*Confessions*). Cf. the conclusion of *Les Amours de Milord Edouard Bomston*: "Mais sa vertu lui donnoit en lui-même une jouissance plus douce que celle de la beauté, et qui ne s'épuise pas comme elle. Plus heureux des plaisirs qu'il se refusoit que le voluptueux n'est de ceux qu'il goûte, il alma plus longtemps, resta libre, et jouit mieux de la vie que ceux qui l'usent" (*Œuvres*, III, 648). With this passage cf. the following from the *Confessions*: "Je sentis, et j'ai souvent senti depuis lors, en y repensant, que, si les sacrifices qu'on fait au devoir et à la vertu, coûtent à faire, on en est bien payé par les doux souvenirs qu'ils laissent au fond du cœur" (*Œuvres*, V, 511).

<sup>2</sup> "Il est un âge pour l'expérience, un autre pour le souvenir. Le sentiment s'éteint à la fin; mais l'âme sensible demeure toujours" (*Œuvres*, III, 123 [*Nouvelle Héloïse*, Seconde Préface]).

<sup>3</sup> Of course another of equal importance at the beginning was the satisfaction, through self-expression in the novel, of his sentimental longings then returning with especial force.

English people, partly because at this time the character was suited to please particularly the French public, then so enthusiastic over the nation across the channel, perhaps also because he still remembered with pleasure the agreeable and intelligent Englishmen he had known in Italy.<sup>1</sup> Crowding back into his mind came former conversations with Diderot and other friends, and with these memories came also impressions from his reading of Locke, Pope, Richardson, and perhaps many more. Then, Prévost's *Cléveland*, still so vivid in his mind, was there to furnish almost a model of what he wished to do: namely, to portray an English *philosophe* virtuous by the excellence of his *cœur sensible* rather than by the deistic principles he imagined himself to be following. Finally, Muralt, read at the very period of composition, furnished the details needed to give accuracy to the portrait and to make it accord in general with the type figure familiar already to the reading public in France.

GEORGE R. HAVENS

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

<sup>1</sup> See above, p. 15.



## A COMMONPLACE IN CORNEILLE'S *MÉLITE*: THE MADNESS OF ÉRASTE

The plot of *Mélite*, the first play of Pierre Corneille, is well known: Éraсте, who loves Méлите, introduces to her his friend Tircis, who thereupon supplants him in the young lady's affections. The first lover, in despair, resolves to get Tircis out of his way by preparing forged love letters from Méлите to Philandre. At first his trick seems to succeed. When Tircis sees the forged letters in the hands of Philandre he believes that Méлите is untrue to him and runs away, speaking of committing suicide. When Méлите hears this she swoons. Éraсте is now informed of the tragic consequences of his forgery. He goes mad with love and remorse, and believes himself in the infernal regions, where he hunts for his Méлите. His ravings continue through several scenes of the fourth and the fifth acts. Finally he comes to his senses and learns that his supposed victims, Tircis and Méлите, are still alive and have resolved upon their marriage. He confesses his guilt, obtains his pardon and the hand of Tircis' sister, Cloris.

In his *Examen de Méлите* of 1660, Corneille confessed that the madness scenes of his first play were not original: "La folie d'Éraсте n'est pas de meilleure trempe. Je la condamnois dès lors en mon âme; mais comme c'étoit un ornement de théâtre qui ne manquoit jamais de plaire et se faisoit souvent admirer, j'affectai volontiers ces grands égarements."<sup>1</sup>

During the quarrel of the *Cid*, one of Corneille's bitterest opponents, Claveret, wrote: "Ceux qui considérèrent bien vostre fin de Méлите, c'est à dire la frénésie d'Éraсте, que tout le monde avoue franchement estre de vostre invention, et qui verront le peu de rapport que ces badineries ont avec ce que vous avez dérobé, jugeront sans doute que le commencement de la *Mélite* . . . n'est pas une pièce de vostre invention."<sup>2</sup> This statement is clearly ironical.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Corneille (ed. Marty-Laveaux), I, 139.

<sup>2</sup> Gasté, *La Querelle du Cid*, p. 309.

<sup>3</sup> Marty-Laveaux took this statement literally: "Bien que Claveret ne conteste pas à Corneille l'invention de la frénésie d'Éraсте," etc. (I, 227, n. 1).

Claveret means that everyone was aware of the imitations of Corneille in the "frénésie d'Éraste." Marty-Laveaux pointed out that three or four verses of the ravings of Éraste bear a certain resemblance to some verses in the pastoral play *La Climène* of De la Croix;<sup>1</sup> and, more recently, Ulrich Meier has tried to demonstrate that Corneille took the idea of the madness of his supplanted lover from *L'Hypochondriaque* of Rotrou.<sup>2</sup> In both these plays the resemblances of the madness scenes to Corneille's Éraste run along general lines, so that a direct influence of either one is very problematic, the more so since similar outbursts of madmen on the stage constituted one of the commonplaces of the literature in the time of Corneille's youth. The purpose of this article is to show the extensive use of the madness device in the early seventeenth-century literature, and to point out some resemblances between Corneille's mad hero and similar heroes in the pastoral plays and the tragi-comedies of the time.

It was, in fact, the most natural thing in the world for a hero of pastoral or of tragi-comedy to become mad, attempt suicide, rush through the infernal regions, or retire to a far-off desert, when refused by, or separated from, his sweetheart. The episode was so overworked that it was the source of no little satire, such as, for example, these verses of *Les Visionnaires* of Desmarets de Saint Sorlin (1637):

Je suis de mille amans sans cesse importunée,  
Et croy qu'à ce tourment le ciel m'a destinée.  
L'on vient me rapporter: Lysis s'en va mourir;  
L'amour de Lysidas s'est tourné en folie;  
Eurylas s'est plongé dans la mélancolie;  
Si Corylas n'en meurt, il sera bien malade; . . .

[Act I, scene 2].

It would be highly repugnant to our modern taste to hear on the stage a madman, who, in well-balanced verses, invoked all the deities of the infernal regions and continued his ravings through one or two acts, as it not infrequently happened about the time of Corneille. We would condemn especially the use of madness for comic effect, such as one finds, for example, in the *Sylvanire* of Honoré d'Urfé,

<sup>1</sup> Played in 1627-28; editions, Paris, 1629, 1636, 1637. The play was plagiarized from the *Isabelle* of P. Ferry, 1610.

<sup>2</sup> Ueber Pierre Corneille's *Erstlingsdrama Mélite*: Festschrift des Gymnasiums zu Schneeberg, 1891, pp. 54-73.

or the *Climène* of De la Croix. But the writers of pastoral and of tragi-comedy, about 1600-1630, were sanctioned by the taste of their time and authorized by the examples which they found in antiquity and in the tragic poets of the latter part of the sixteenth century. They apparently did not feel the enormous distance, which, aesthetically speaking, separates the ravings, for example, of the Hercules of Seneca or the Saul of De la Taille, and those of a love-mad shepherd. The *Mélite* of Corneille shows this same lack of taste. Érase is presented as a young Parisian gentleman of about 1630. For three acts we can picture him in his light-green costume à la *Céladon*, paying to Mélite his exaggerated compliments. But when he has lost his senses, his ravings resemble those of a Greek demigod.

The succession of the incidents in the madness scenes of the *Mélite* is as follows: (1) Érase believes that the lightning from Olympus has burst the earth and that he is in the underworld. (2) He inquires of the Styx and of the shades if they have not seen Tircis and Mélite, whom he tries vainly to find in the infernal regions. (3) He takes his helper, Cliton, for Charon and jumps upon his back to be carried over the Styx, and in this posture is carried off the stage. (4) He fights with gods and the shades; they flee and in their haste the Parques forget their scissors. His appearance has thrown frightened Hades into confusion. (5) He takes Philandre for Minos and confesses his guilt. Finally he believes the old nurse is his mistress, Mélite, and makes ardent declarations of his love to her before he happily recovers his senses. Corneille, having entitled his play a "pièce comique" (edition of 1633), clearly tried to obtain comic effects from these ravings of Érase.

For the first part of his madness scenes Corneille seems to have been influenced more or less by the numerous madness scenes in the contemporary literature, and perhaps more directly by his reminiscences of Hardy's *Alcméon ou la Vengeance féminine*. In the latter play Alcméon becomes insane under the influence of a poisoned jewel. The first developments of the ravings of Érase and of Alcméon are almost identical:

ALCMÉON: Dieus, He! quelle voix de l'Erèbe m'appelle?  
D'où viennent parmy l'air ces flambans tourbillons? [Hardy.]

- ÉRASTE: Quel murmure confus! et qu'entends-je hurler!  
Que de pointes de feu se perdent parmi l'air? [Corneille.]
- ALCMÉON: J'oy le choc d'un combat, je voy fondre un tonnerre  
Du faite de l'Olympe au centre de la terre. [Hardy.]
- ÉRASTE: Les Dieux à mes forfaits ont dénoncé la guerre;  
Leur foudre décoché vient de fendre la terre. [Corneille.]
- ALCMÉON: Mais la terre mugit sous mes pieds se fendant. [Hardy.]<sup>1</sup>
- ÉRASTE: La terre à ce dessein m'ouvre son large flanc. [Corneille.]

Another point of identity between the play of Hardy and that of Corneille is that both Alcméon and Éraсте draw their swords and pursue the fleeing spirits. The former, attacking the ghosts with his sword, exclaims:

S'il faut que ma fureur contrainte se redresse,  
L'épée au poing, je puis, je le puis et le faut,  
Soutenir, repousser et vaincre cet assaut.  
Donnons, donnons sans crainte à travers de ces ombres  
Renvoyons-les, mon bras, en leur cavernes sombres.  
Couards, vous fuyez donc, vous ne m'attendez pas!<sup>2</sup>

Éraсте, who, in the earlier editions of the *Mélite*, is represented "l'épée au poing," declaims:

En vain je les rappelle, en vain pour se défendre  
La honte et le devoir leur parlant de m'attendre,  
Ces laches escadrons de fantômes affreux  
Cherchent leur assurance aux cachots les plus creux.

Éraсте describes his appearance, which has thrown all the underworld into confusion. The shades and the gods fear him and have fled:

Ma voix met tout en fuite et dans ce vaste effroi,  
La peur saisit si bien les ombres et leur roi . . .  
Tisiphone tremblante, Aleuton et Mégère,  
De leurs flambeaux puants ont éteint la lumière,  
Et tiré de leur chef les serpents d'alentour,  
De crainte que leurs yeux fissent quelque faux jour, . . .  
Éaque épouvanté se croit trop en danger,  
Et fuit son criminel au lieu de le juger;  
Clothon même et ses sœurs, à l'aspect de ma lame,  
De peur de tarder trop, n'osant couper ma trame,  
À peine ont eu loisir d'emporter leurs fuseaux,  
Si bien qu'en ce désordre oubliant leurs ciseaux . . .

[pp. 230-31].

<sup>1</sup> *Œuvres de Hardy* (ed. E. Stengel), V, 224-25

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 225.



For this part of the poetic madness Corneille did not lack examples in contemporary plays. *La Rodomontade*, a tragedy by Charles Bautier, i.e., Meliglose (1605), transports its hero to the underworld, where his shadow frightens the spirits and where Charon refuses to take him aboard. This detail is reproduced in other plays, in similar circumstances, and in the *Mélite*, where Éraсте, taking Cliton for the infernal ferryman, exclaims:

Quoi! tu veux te sauver à l'autre bord sans moi!

In *La généreuse Allemande* of A. Mareschal (1630) a scene is found, also intended as comical, where a similar description is given of the terror which the mad hero pretends to inspire in the infernal regions:

Dieux! tout est en allarme en ces demeures sombres;  
Un Hercule nouveau trouble encore les ombres;  
Les foudres ont trouvé le chemin d'icy bas;  
Les Tytans dechainez font de nouveaux combats;  
Les Parques sont aux mains; le desordre s'augmente;  
Cerbère s'est caché de peur chez Radamante,  
Qui sous un corps fumant de souffre & de vapeur  
Fuit luy-mesme, & se met sous les lois de la peur;  
Icy tombe de crainte Ichare en l'onde noire;  
La Tantale en fuyant passe l'eau sans en boire . . .

[Seconde journée, Act III, scene 2].

In the third act of *Les travaux d'Ulysse*, a tragi-comedy of J. G. Durval, printed at Paris without date in 1630-31, and with date in 1631, Ulysses frightens the underworld in the same way:

Les fantômes affreux ont secoué leurs fers,  
Et sont tombez de peur dans le fond des enfers . . .  
Les ombres de tous ceux que Cloton precipite  
Dans le creux Acheron, ou dedans le Cocyte,  
Et les esprits errants sur l'ardent Phlegeton,  
Sont tombez de frayeur en l'Orque de Pluton . . .  
J'ay fait boire Charon, qui dessus le rivage  
De ses fleuves vouloit m'empescher le passage:  
Et troublant de Cloton l'ordinaire repos,  
J'ay rompu de despit le mestier d'Atropos.  
J'ay cassé les fuseaux des parques filandières [Act III, scene 2].

After the mythological outbursts described above, Corneille's mad hero takes the old nurse for the beautiful *Mélite*. The eagerness

to recognize their mistress, or occasionally another person, in strangers or ghosts is a current trait in the portrayal of love-mad characters on the stage of the time. It is as general as the descent to the underworld in all the plays where madness was introduced as an "ornement de théâtre." Take, for example, the *Bergeries* of Racan (1618). Alcidor, the insane lover in this play, thinks that he is dead and already among the shades, as does Éraste in *Mélite*; he is frightened by approaching demons or ghosts, one of whom he takes for his mistress; like Éraste he recovers his sanity. The following passage is typical:

ALCIDOR: En quel lieu m'a conduit la cruauté du sort ?  
 Suis-je en terre ou dans l'eau ? suis-je vivant ou mort ? . . .  
 Que de phantosmes vains en ces rives s'amassent !  
 Sont-ce morts ou démons qui s'approchent de moy ?  
 Tout fait peur à mes yeux ; Dieu qu'est ce que je voy ?  
 Belle âme, le miroir des âmes les plus belles ;  
 Avez-vous donc quitté vos depouilles mortelles ?  
 Quels tourmens douloureux, quels funestes remors,  
 Vous ont fait ennuyer dedans un si beau corps ?  
 Quoi ! voulez-vous encor, o ma chère infidelle,  
 Traverser mon repos en la nuit éternelle ? . . .<sup>1</sup>

The similarity of Corneille's method is evident if one reads these lines of the *Mélite*:

ÉRASTE (*seeing the ghosts*):  
 Vous donc, esprits légers, qui, manque de tombeaux,  
 Tournoyez vagabonds à l'entour de ces eaux,  
 A qui Charon cent ans refuse sa nacelle,  
 Ne m'en pourriez vous point donner quelques nouvelles ?  
 (*He takes the nurse for Mélite*)  
 Je vois déjà Mélite. Ah ! belle ombre, voici  
 L'ennemi de votre heur qui vous cherchoit ici. . . .

With both these examples may be compared the following verses from the fifth act of the *Sylvie* of Mairêt, which is of 1628 (privilege of 1627):

FLORISEL: Mais n'est-ce pas ici le royaume des morts ?  
 Nos esprits n'ont ils pas abandonné nos corps ?  
 (*Takes a ghost for his father*)  
 N'es-tu pas satisfait de nos travaux soufferts,  
 Sans nous venir troubler dans les enfers ?  
 O père sans pitié, ton âme criminelle,  
 Vient-elle icy nous faire une guerre éternelle ?

<sup>1</sup> *Œuvres de Racan, Bib. Elzév.*, pp. 80-81.

In Hardy's pastoral play *Alphée*, the mad shepherd, Euriale, has a similar vision. In Pichou's *Folies de Cardenio*,<sup>1</sup> Cardenio maddened by love, takes the barber for his mistress, Luscinde. In the *Pirame et Thisbe* of Théophile de Viaud, the hero, temporarily bereft of his reason, exclaims:

Tu viens donc, inhumaine, en ces bords malheureux,  
Pour espier nos esprits amoureux?

In the *Hypocondriaque* of Rotrou (played in 1628), the hero Cloridan believes he is dead, and tries to find his Perside among the souls in the underworld. He takes Cléonice at first for his sweetheart and later for a dryad. Many more examples of this traditional scene can be found in the literature which was in fashion when the young Corneille wrote his "coup d'essai." Other parts of the *Mélite*, for example, the recovery of Éraсте from madness, follow closely the convention of the stage of the time.

Although scenes of madness are to be found in the French tragedies of the sixteenth century, the fashion seems to have reached its highest point between 1610 and 1635. In the sixteenth-century tragedies, they owed their presence especially to the influence of classic example, and particularly of the *Hercules furens*, the *Medea*, and other plays of Seneca. This theme, with all its opportunities for turgid declamation, made a very strong appeal to the Renaissance poets. Various examples can be pointed out, such as the *Saul furieux* of De la Taille (performed in 1562), or the *Aman* of André de Rivaudeau (1561). In 1603, the Rouen printer, Theodore Reinsart, published a tragedy, *Ulysse*, by Jacques de Champ-Repus. In the final scenes, Télégon, crazed with remorse over his accidental killing of his father, exclaims:

Sus donc, monstres hideux, qui tenez le rivage  
De l'enfer Averno, plein d'horreur et de rage,  
Vivez, tournez, riblez à mes funestes cris,  
Et venez sans tarder des antres plus noircis,  
Grondans, jappans, hurlant d'une façon terrible,  
. . . Accablez-moy ici [*Œuvres* (ed. 1864), p. 70].

The tragedy of J. de Schélandre, *Tyr et Sidon*, in its first form (1608) ends with the madness of the unhappy king, Tiribaze, whose ravings are similar to those in the passage cited above. Other tragedies too are adorned with this "ornement de théâtre."

<sup>1</sup> Privilège of 1625.

The writers of tragi-comedies and pastoral plays appropriated quite naïvely these conventional madness scenes from the tragedies. Since by definition their works must end happily, they gave to these scenes a happy dénouement. Whereas the hero of the tragedy, recovering from his attack of frenzy, found around him the bleeding bodies of his victims and immediately turned to thoughts of suicide, in the tragi-comedies and the pastoral plays he suddenly recovered his reason and nothing more fatal than a marriage resulted. In 1569, François de Belleforest published his *Pastorale amoureuse* in which the shepherd, Sylvie's reason is affected by the excessive grief caused by the rejection of his advances on the part of the fair shepherdess, Camille. In 1567 Pierre le Loyer published his *Le Muet insensé, comédie en cinq actes*, in which a lover receives a charm from a magician, but through a misuse of it becomes mad. He is, in the end, happily cured. Mad lovers are especially prevalent in the plays which appeared about the time that the *Mélite* was being composed, or soon after the representation of the play, so that they may have been acted before Corneille's play. Reference has already been made to the *Bergeries* of Racan, the *Folies de Cardenio* of Pichou, plays of Hardy, the *Sylvie* of Mairet, the *Hypocondriaque* of Rotrou, and the *Généreuse Allemande* of Mareschal. In *Sylvanire ou la morte vive* of Honoré d'Urfé (privilege dated 1625), the shepherd, Adraste, becomes insane through love for the shepherdess, Doris. The anonymous play *La Folie de Silène* (1624) shows the servant of the old Polite insane, and, taking his old master for a nymph, pursuing him with ridiculous love declarations. The conventional situation also occurs in a play printed in Rouen in 1625 with the following formidable title: *Le Guerrier repent, pastorale tragique et morale en laquelle les passions de l'homme sont manifestement représentées avec le contentement de la vie solitaire de l'hermite Hysipille; les aventureuses rencontres de la belle nymphe Rosymène, entre lesquelles reluyt le flambeau radieux de sa chasteté parmi les erreurs du Guerrier Phallacie qui, enfin touché d'un saint remord de ses meurtres sanglans, se réduit à la vie religieuse et solitaire avec Hysipille dans les déserts. Par maistre Jacques le Clerc, prestre indigne, précepteur des lettres Latines à Saint Vallery sur Somme.* In *La Carline, comédie pastorale* of Antoine Gaillard, Sieur de la Portenille (Paris, 1626) we find a shepherd, Nicot,

who is guilty of a crime of the same nature as that of Éraсте; this is also followed by scenes of remorse and insanity. *Philine ou l'amour contraire*, *Pastorale par le sieur de la Morelle*, which seems to have been played about 1628 (printed at Paris in 1630) presented the madness of Amaranthe. Liridas is a victim of this same love madness in the *Climène* of the Sieur de la Croix (1628); the same thing occurs in the *Pastoral tragi-comédie* of Carité (Paris, 1627) and in *Cléonice, ou l'amour téméraire* (Paris, 1630). According to the *Mémoire* of Mahelot, the titles of three lost plays of Hardy are: *La Folie de Clidamante*, *La Folie d'Isabelle*, and *La Folie de Turlupin*. One might also compare the mad outbursts of Hérode in the *Mariamne* of Hardy, and those in the *Mariamne* of Tristan l'Hermite.

In *La Folie du Sage* of Tristan (1645) we find another form of madness: the book-and-knowledge madness. In the *Hôpital des fous* of Charles Beys, various madmen are put on the scene: a philosopher, a musician, an advocate, a soldier, an alchemist, and an astrologer. This play was first published in Paris in 1629, and is the same play as *Les Illustres fous* of 1652. As a variety we find mad ladies: for example, in *La Pèlerine amoureuse* of Rotrou (printed in 1637) imitated from the *Pellegrina* of Girolamo Bargogli, Bélie pretends to be mad to escape from a detested marriage. In the third act of the *Cléomedon* of P. du Ryer (1633 or 1634) Cléomedon, being prevented from marrying Célanire, loses his intelligence, recovers, and marries his sweetheart. In the same way Policandre loses Basilie and his reason, and regains both in the *Les Aventures de Policandre et de Basilie*, *tragédie par le sieur du Vieuget* (printed in 1632, played probably in 1630).

Thus the number of plays in which the mad lover was put on the scene about the time of the composition of Corneille's *Mélite*, taken in connection with the examples given in the first part of this paper, show how thoroughly the madness of Eraste in the *Mélite* conformed to a prevailing fashion in the literary production of about 1630.

GUSTAVE L. VAN ROOSBROECK

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA



## ON THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE GRAIL ROMANCES. I

### THE DATE OF THE *PERLESVAUS*

The purpose of the following pages is to establish, as far as the evidence permits, the date of the Grail romance *Perlesvaus*; incidentally it is also to set in a clearer light than before the Glastonbury associations of the work. When Tennyson says in his well-known idyll through the mouth of the monk:

. . . . From our old books I know  
That Joseph came of old to Glastonbury.  
And there the heathen Prince, Arviragus,  
Gave him an isle of marsh whereon to build;  
And there he built with wattles from the marsh  
A little lonely church in days of yore,  
For so they say, these books of ours. . . .

he is reciting—somewhat freely, it is true—not a mere pious fiction but an established tradition going back at least to the end of the twelfth century. This fact is familiar enough. What is less familiar is the manner in which the history of the abbey was interwoven with the Grail legend—recalling vividly the identifications with *loca sancta* which M. Bédier has shown to be characteristic of the *chansons de geste*. Previous material on the subject will be found in *MODERN PHILOLOGY*, I (1903), 255 ff., and in the [North Carolina] *Studies in Philology*, XV (1918), 7–14. I have brought this and additional evidence together here with the hope of settling not only the *terminus a quo* of the *Perlesvaus*, which is certainly 1191,<sup>1</sup> but also its approximate *terminus ad quem*.

In the Potvin edition the *Perlesvaus* concludes with the following words:

(a) Li latins de coi cist estoires fust traite an romanz fu pris an l'ille d'Avalon, en une sainte messon de religion qui siet au chief des mores [Hatton

<sup>1</sup> See *Studies in Philology*, loc. cit.



82: mares] aventureusses, là où li roi Artus et la roïne Guenièvre gissent, par le tesmoing de prodomes religieux qui là dedanz sont, qui tote l'estoire en ont, vraie dès le comencement tresqu'à la fin.

(b) Après iceste estoire, commence li contes si come Brians des Illes guerpi le roi Artus por Lancelot que il n'amoit mie et come il aséura le roi Claudas, qui le roi Ban de Bénoic toli sa terre. Si parole cis contes comment il le conquist et par quel manière, et si com Galobrus de la Vermeille Lande vint à la cort le roi Artus por aidier Lancelot, quar il estoit de son lignage. Cist contes est mout lons et mout aventureus et poisanz; mès li livres s'en tera ore atant trus [tres] qu'à une autre foiz.

(c) Por li seingnor de Neele fist li seingnor de Cambrein cest livre escrire, qui onques mès ne fu troitz que une seule foiz avec [avant] cestui en roumanz; et cil qui avant cestui fust fez est si anciens qu'à grant poine an péust l'an choisir la lestre. Et sache bien misires Johan de Neele que l'an doit tenir ceste conte cheir, ne l'an ne doit mie dire à jent malentendable; quar bone chose, qui est espendue outre mauveses genz, n'est onques en bien recordée par els.

Only one of the MSS of the romance, namely that of Brussels (B), which Potvin has printed, contains the three statements just given. Statement (a), however, occurs also in Hatton 82 (O) of the Bodleian library at Oxford, and although the other MSS of the romance are too fragmentary to establish whether they possessed it or not, it belongs without doubt to the original text, as subsequent facts will show. As to statements (b) and (c), there is no positive evidence whether they belong to the original or are peculiar to B; both are lacking in O (in general, the best and completest text), the late Welsh translation of the *Perlesvaus* lacks the entire passage given above, as do the incunabula published in Paris in 1516 and 1523, and the fragmentary MSS also throw no light on the question.<sup>1</sup> The fact, however, that (b) and (c) are lacking in O, which is otherwise more complete than B,<sup>2</sup> at least argues against their presence in the original MS.

Leaving statement (b), to the effect that the romance was to be followed by another story,<sup>2</sup> for later consideration, we may confine our attention to (a) and (c) respectively. In (a), then, we find the first problem to be discussed.

<sup>1</sup> See my *Study of the Old French Grail Romance Perlesvaus*. Baltimore, 1902.

<sup>2</sup> See below, p. 166.

I. THE GLASTONBURY CONNECTIONS AND THE *terminus a quo*

As I have previously shown (*Modern Philology*, I, 255 ff.), the assertion that the *Perlesvaus* was translated from the Latin is secondary to the claim that the original came from "the Isle of Avalon, from a holy house of religion that standeth at the head of the Adventurous Moors, there where King Arthur and Queen Guenevere lie, according to the witness of the worthy religious men who are there." No Latin original has yet been found for any of the Grail works; but under the date of 1191 the *Chronica Majora*<sup>1</sup> and Giraldus Cambrensis<sup>2</sup> both relate the finding of Arthur's body: the one *apud Glastoniam*, the other *in insula Avallonia, quae nunc autem Glastonia dicitur*; and whereas the former speaks only of the *inclitus rex Arturus*, the latter adds *cum Wennevereia uxore sua secunda*, whose golden hair he cannot forego the pleasure of mentioning. Baist, Lot, Thurneysen, Newell, and Fletcher have all discussed the question of Arthur's tomb in connection with the *De Antiquitate Glastoniensis Ecclesiae* of William of Malmesbury, and further details will be noted presently. It is sufficient to state now that among the extravagant claims made by the Glastonbury monks in their struggle for the primacy of their abbey, situated as it was on the borderland of Wales, was that of possessing the remains of Arthur and his queen. The report of this discovery came as the climax of nearly a century of skillfully managed propaganda. It would be interesting to know the extent to which the *Perlesvaus* shared in this movement.

In addition to statement (a), the romance contains the following traces of Glastonbury influence:

1. As in Robert de Boron's *Joseph 3128* (*Le fil Alein atendera*), the father of the Grail hero is Alain (Chantilly MS); the latter's father, however, is Glais li Gros, who has twelve sons:

Cil qui fu chiés du lignage de par son père ot nom Nichodemus. Glais li gros de la croix des hermites fu peres Alain. Cil Alains ot ix freres, mout

<sup>1</sup> See the fundamental article of W. W. Newell, *Publ. of the Mod. Lang. Assoc.*, XVIII (1903), 505.

<sup>2</sup> *De princ. instruct.* (Rolls Series, 1891), VIII, 126. For bibliography on the entire question see Newell, *op. cit.*, to which should be added Fletcher, *Harvard Studies and Notes*, X (1906).

bons chevaliers autresint conme il fu. . . . Alains li gros fu li ainez, Gorgalians fu après, Bruns Brandalis fu li tiers, etc.<sup>1</sup>

Compare the passage on Glast, the eponymic founder of the abbey, in the *De Antiquitate*, and Lot's discussion (*Romania*, XXVII [1898], 531) on his twelve descendants, erroneously given by William of Malmesbury as his "brothers":

Nomina autem fratrum inferius adnotantur: Ludnerth, Morgen, Catgur, Cathmor . . . . Glasteing. Hic est ille Glasteing, qui per mediterraneos Anglos . . . . per inviam et aquosam viam . . . . sequens, porcellos suos juxta ecclesiam de qua nobis sermo est lactentem sub malo invenit.

And, as Lot points out, in William's source the name is given as Glast, so that the kinship of the two passages is obvious.

2. The introductory episode of the romance (Potvin, pp. 4 ff.) is an edifying account of King Arthur's visit to the Chapel of St. Austin in the White Forest, whence he returns to Cardoil with the fresh resolve to do honor and largess, and to lead an active, chivalric life. Accordingly, Arthur holds a plenary court on St. John's Day at Pannenoisance (Penzance), *qui siet sor la mer de Gales*. At this point the romance proper begins.

This introductory episode (for the details of which see *Modern Philology*, I, 248) recurs as a separate tale, quite apart from any Perceval or Grail story in *Johannis Glastoniensis* (fifteenth century); it is also found—this time with a direct reference to the *Graal*, *le lyvre de le seint vassal* (our romance)—in the verse-portion of *Fulk Fitz-Warin*, a fourteenth-century prose redaction of a French poem, apparently written during the last quarter of the thirteenth century.<sup>2</sup> The author of this poem is unknown, but he identifies the White Forest with Shropshire, the scene of Fulk's exploits:

Quar chescun de vous deit estre ensur  
 Qe en le temps le roy Arthur  
 La Blanche Launde fust appelee  
 Qe ore est Blauncheville nomee.  
 Quar en cel pays fust la chapele  
 De Seynt Austyn . . . .

<sup>1</sup> Potvin, *Perceval le Gallois*, I, p. 3.

<sup>2</sup> See *Fulk Fitz-Warin*, now edited by A. C. Wood (London, 1911), p. II. Miss Weston (*Romania*, XLIII [1914], 420 ff.) deals with the passage. I am far from following her, however, in her conclusions; they seem to me to go too far. Shé is mistaken, moreover, in giving me credit for first mentioning the *Perlesvaus* reference in *Fulk*; it had been mentioned by Evans in his translation of the *Perlesvaus* (*High History of the Holy Graal*, II, 290).

Thus, whether or not the introductory episode was part of the Glastonbury records *before* it appeared in the *Perlesvaus*,<sup>1</sup> it obviously was borrowed from a MS of our romance in the thirteenth century by one who was glorifying Fulk, an outlaw knight of Shropshire, a country lying to the north of Glastonbury and bordering on Wales. The fact is singular, if not significant.

3. The *Perlesvaus* records various visits to Avalon (Glastonbury). The most detailed of these is that of Lancelot (Potvin, p. 261):

Il chevauche tant qu'il est venuz . . . à une grant valée où il avoit forest d'une part et d'autre, et duroit la valée .x. granz lyeues galesches. Il esgarde à destre desus la monteigne de la valée et voit une chapele novelement feste, qui mout estoit bele et riche, si estoit couverte de plonc et avoit par derrière .ii. coinz qui sanbloient estre d'or. Dejuste cele chapele, avoit .iii. messons moult richement herbergiées, et estoit chascune par soi et ainz (tenant) [Halton 82: si joignoient] à la chapele. Il avoit mout biau cimetire à la chapele environ, qui clos estoit à la ronde de la forest, et descendoit une fontaine, moult clère, de la hautece de la forest, par devant la chapele, et coroit an la valée par grant ravine; et chascune des messons avoit son vergier, et li vergier son clos. Lancelot oï vespres chanter à la chapele, il vit .i. santier qui cele part tornoit; mès la monteigne estoit si roiste que il n'i pot mie aler à cheval, ainz descendi, si le trest par la rène après lui tant qu'il vint près de la chapele.

Here he meets three hermits, who tell him that the place is Avalon. The chapel is richly decorated in the interior and contains two tombs. When Lancelot asks whose they are, he is told:

Por le roi Artus et por la réine Guenièvre.—Ja n'est mie morz li rois Artus, feit Lanceloz.—Nenil, sire, se Dex plect; mès li cors de la réine gist an cest sarquex devers nos, et an l'autre est li chiés son fill, trèsqu' à icele hore que li rois soit finiz . . . mès la réine dist à la mort que l'an méist le cors dejuste le sien quant il fineroit. De ce avons-nos les lestres et son sèel en ceste chapele, et cest leu fist-ele renouveler an tel manière ançois que ele morust.<sup>2</sup>

Lancelot prays all night in the chapel, in front of one of the images of Our Lady, and returns the next day to Cardoil.

<sup>1</sup> Baist (*Zeitch. für roman. Phil.*, XIX, 344) says: "Der vierte Artikel dieser Reihe wird zeigen, wie im letzten Viertel des 12 Jh. in Glastonbury, eine fromme Arthur-geschichte erlabet ist, welche die Romane, insbesondere den Perceval verwertete, Joseph u. die klostergründenden Eremiten in höchst phantastischer Beziehung zum Arturkreis brachte." This article of Baist was never published, but the implication is clear.

<sup>2</sup> In the Welsh *Seint Greal*, I, 679, the chapel is on "a small round mountain."

Finally, a visit of Arthur to Guenevere's tomb is briefly described in Potvin (p. 270):

Li rois Artus et misires Gauvains ont tant chevauchié qu'il sont venuz en l'ile d'Avalon, là où la roïne gist. . . . Mès vos poez bien dire que li rois ne fust mie joieus, quant il vit le sarquex où la réine gissoit et celui où li chief de son fiuz gissoit; adonc li renovela ses deus, et dist que cest seint leu de cele seinte chapele doit il plus amer que touz les autres de sa terre.

It was, however, Arthur himself who had the "head" of his son, Lohoh[l]t, placed in Avalon (Potvin, p. 222):

Mes, ainçois que li rois s'an partist, fist-il le chief porter en l'ille de [A]valon, en une chapele qui estoit de Nostre Dame, où il avoit un seint hermite pseudome qui mout estoit bien de Nostre Seignor.

From these accounts it is clear that our author thought of Avalon as situated in a fertile valley surrounded by forests (and by swamps or moors), with a chapel dedicated to the Virgin on a rather steep hill. The chapel can hardly be on the summit, as there is a swift stream that descends in front of it and it is contiguous to three monastic buildings, each of which has its own orchard, while the chapel itself has an adjoining cemetery.<sup>1</sup> The chapel contains the tomb of Guenevere and another containing the head of Loholt and reserved for the king when he shall die. Twice the text refers to its being renovated or rebuilt. A priori, there can be no doubt that the writer had in mind the twelfth-century Glastonbury with its hill or Tor and its well-known Lady-chapel. A glance at the chronicle sources is instructive.

In the certainly authentic part of the *De Antiquitate*, William of Malmesbury tells of the foundation of St. Mary's, locally known as the Old Church, which was rich in relics of the utmost sanctity. Naïvely he accepts the extravagant forgeries as to its antiquity, and speaks (in his *Gesta Regum*, p. 37) of its being *in regno Britanniae . . . prima, et fons et origo totius religionis*, leaving no doubt as to what he thought of its primacy in Britain. Various accounts

<sup>1</sup> In *Studies in Philology*, XV, 12, I failed to note that the text does not actually place St. Mary's on the top of the hill but allows one to think that it was on its slope. At least there is no reason for taking the expression *deus la monteigne* in too literal a sense. The *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, s.s. "Glastonbury" says: "The town lies in the midst of orchards and water-meadows, reclaimed from the fens which encircled Glastonbury Tor, a considerable height once an island, but now, with the surrounding flats, a peninsula washed on three sides by the river Brue." An excellent idea of the topography is to be found in Dugdale, *Monasticon*, I (2d engraving).

exist as to its foundation. One of these, at the beginning of the *De Antiquitate* (according to Newell by the hand of an interpolator, about 1191), ascribes the foundation to twelve disciples of the apostle Philip, who apparently under the direction of Joseph of Arimathea came from France to Britain, where they obtained from the king the concession of a swampy and forest-girt island (*silvis, rubis, atque paludibus circumdatam*), known to the natives as Iniswitrin (as the text explains, the Welsh word for Glastonbury or Avalon); after a time, these saints were visited by the angel Gabriel, who admonished them to erect, in a certain spot, a church, which they constructed of boughs and dedicated to the Virgin.<sup>1</sup> On the other hand, in the *Gesta Regum*, pp. 23, 24, William gives an alternative account of the founding of the church by nameless missionaries, sent by Pope Eleutherius to Lucius, king of Britain, although in the same breath William affirms that a "reputable document" assigns the act to the disciples of Christ (i.e., Philip and his followers). In any case, both views were certainly current by 1191 and concur in affirming the sanctity and primacy of St. Mary's; indeed, the *Gesta Regum* adds that the church became a chosen residence for men of letters and religion, "the antiquity of which renown is shown by the fact that Gildas, to whom the Britons owe their credit with foreigners, was attracted to the holiness of the place, where he remained for many years."<sup>2</sup>

According to the Glastonbury records, however, the bodies of Arthur and Guenevere were not found in St. Mary's but in the cemetery outside. The *De Antiquitate* (pp. 42-44) states:

Quantum vero Glastoniae ecclesia fuerit etiam primatibus patriae venerabilis, ut ibi potissimum sub protectione Dei genetricis operirentur diem resurrectionis, multa sunt indicio quibus pro cautela fastidii, abstineo. Praetermitto de Arturo, inclito rege Britonum, in cimiterio monachorum inter duas pyramides cum sua conjuge tumulato, de multis etiam Britonum principibus.

To be sure, Newell assigns the last sentence of this passage to the "recast" and not to the *De Antiquitate* proper. But since the

<sup>1</sup> Newell, *op. cit.*, p. 466.

<sup>2</sup> Newell, p. 478. See F. Lot, *Mélanges bretonnes* (Paris, 1907), p. 267, for an account of how the insular *Vita Gildae* (Mommson, *Mon. Germ. Hist.*, XIII, 107-10) by Caradoc of Llancarven connects Gildas' fame with the abbey.

"recast" was made before the year 1200 and probably in the very year of Arthur's supposed disinterment (Newell, p. 510), this fact need not disturb us here. Both the *Chronica Majora*<sup>1</sup> and Giraldus Cambrensis give 1191 as the date of the disinterment. Giraldus, who writes as an eyewitness (*De princ. instruct.*, VIII, 126), has the more interesting account:

Arthuri quoque Britonum regis inclyti memoria est non supprimenda, quem monasterii Glastoniensis egregii, cujus et ipse patronus suis diebus fuerat praecipuus et largitor ac sublevator magnificus, historiae multum extollunt. Prae cunctis enim ecclesiis regni sui sanctae Dei genetricis Mariae Glastoniensem ecclesiam plus dilexit et prae caeteris longe majori devotione promovit. . . . Hujus autem corpus, quod quasi phantasticum in fine . . . his nostris diebus apud Glastoniam inter lapideas pyramides duas, in coemiterio sacro quondam erectas, profundius in terra quercu concava reconditum, et signatum miris indicii et quasi miraculosis, est inventum, et in ecclesiam cum honore translatum marmoreoque decenter tumulo commendatum. Unde et crux plumbea lapide supposito, non superius ut [nostris] solet diebus, [sed] inferiori potius ex parte infixā, quam nos quoque vidimus, namque tractavimus litteras has insculptas et non eminentes et exstantes, sed magis interius ad lapidem versas continebat: "Hic jacet sepultus rex Arthurus cum Wenneuereia vxore sua secunda in insula Aualonia."

Giraldus makes the further statement that the find came as the result of a long search on the part of Abbot Henry, who was guided by documents, by semi-legible letters on the two pyramids, and by the vision of monks. How came it that the author of *Perlesvaus*, so close to this account in other respects, omits the disinterment story? The question is not hard to answer.

In the twelfth century, Glastonbury possessed three churches: that of St. Mary, the oldest; that of the apostles Peter and Paul, which was much larger; and that of St. Michael de Torre, a dependent church, which stood on the Tor, outside of Glastonbury proper. In 1184 a terrible fire destroyed all the buildings of the monastery, except a camera and a bell tower. Henry II intrusted the task of reconstruction to his chamberlain Radulf. The Church of St. Mary, with its venerable tradition, was rebuilt first in its former position and dimensions, but was now connected with the larger church in the manner of a Lady-chapel. It was rededicated in 1186.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Newell, p. 505, note.



Owing to lack of funds, however, the larger church was not finished; in fact, it remained incomplete until the fourteenth century.<sup>1</sup> If, therefore, St. Mary's was the Glastonbury church *par excellence* before the fire, such was now the case more than ever; and the reference to it in the *Perlesvaus* as a Lady-chapel tallies with the situation after the fire and not before it (*si joignoient à la chapele*). Further, since Arthur had to be kept alive for the purpose of the romance, the author contented himself with the account of Guenevere's death and the mention of the tombs in the Lady-chapel, which the text says was lately renovated (*renoveler*). This, it is true, renders the work unique among Grail stories in that it sacrifices the continuation of Lancelot's intrigue with the queen, but since a sacrifice in the interests of Glastonbury was necessary, the death of Guenevere was the best to make, especially as it conformed to the ecclesiastical character of the work in general. Incidentally let it be said that thus is removed the objection commonly brought against the early dating of the *Perlesvaus* on the ground that the death of Guenevere in the course of the story contradicts the Grail-Lancelot cycle; for, if my view be correct, the Grail-Lancelot cycle did not yet exist. Finally, Giraldus' statement, *prae cunctis enim ecclesiis regni sui sanctae Dei genetricis Mariae Glastoniensem ecclesiam plus dilexit*, finds its echo in our author's remark that Arthur loved this place and this church *plus que touz les autres de sa terre*.

4. The *Perlesvaus* again and again refers to the scribe or recorder of the Latin original as Josephus. *Josephus le mist an remembrance*, says the first paragraph, *par l'anoncion de la voiz d'un ange, por ce que la vérité fust seue par son escript de bons chevaliers et de bons preudesommes*. Potvin (p. 2) reads: *Josephus nos raconte ceste seinte estoire*; and at the close of the last branch: *Joseph[us] par cui il est an remembrance done la beneicon Nostre Seingnor a toz cez qui l'entendent et l'honorent*. He is known as *le bon clerc* and *le bon hermite* (Potvin, p. 79), and it was he who celebrated the first mass (Potvin, p. 113). Who can this person be? Heinzel (*Französische Gralromane*, p. 107) suggests that it is no other than Josephus Flavius, the Jewish historian. "Die Auffassung des Josephus Flavius,"

<sup>1</sup> Newell, p. 464; Goodall, *Guide to Glastonbury* (5th ed.), p. 64, says that the churches were united by forming a "galilee."

he says, "als christlicher Priester wurde ausser durch seine Gelehrsamkeit vielleicht noch dadurch befördert, dass nach der Meinung der Jacobiten und überhaupt der Syrier der Priester Caiphas sich nachmals bekehrt und unter den Namen Josephus (Flavius), wie er schon früher hiess, die bekannten Werke geschrieben habe." What makes this hypothesis extremely plausible is the fact that for the passage on the apostle Philip, cited above, the *De Antiquitate*<sup>1</sup> refers us to Freulf: *ut testatur Freulfus, libro secundo, capitulo iiii*. According to a catalogue of the year 1247,<sup>2</sup> Glastonbury Abbey possessed two MSS of Freulf, bishop of Lisieux (822); and Freulf, in the chapter cited and the chapters that follow it, adduces the authority of Josephus Flavius, whom he calls by the single name of Josephus.<sup>3</sup> Supposing that the author of the earliest redaction of the *Perlesvaus* was associated with Glastonbury, the choice of Josephus as sponsor for his work could easily have been inspired by Freulf, inasmuch as Freulf was mentioned as authoritative in the standard work on the antiquity of the abbey.

In the light of these facts, we are justified in accepting the view of Baist, expressed in 1892 and in 1895 (though without the evidence), that the *Perlesvaus* was composed in the interest of Glastonbury Abbey. Further, it is certain that the work was not composed until 1191 and probably within a reasonable time after this date, inasmuch as the text dwells on the presence of Guenevere's and Arthur's tombs within the Lady-chapel, *novelement feste (cest leu fist-ele renover)*—a phrase which can only refer to an event still fresh in the minds of contemporaries. The obvious religious purpose of the romance,<sup>4</sup> its conception of the Grail as a relic of the cruci-

<sup>1</sup> Newell, p. 471.

<sup>2</sup> *Johannis Glastoniensis* (Ed. Hearne), p. 434; cf. Lot, *Romania*, XXVII, 542.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Migne, *Patr. lat.*, CVI, 1140 ff.

<sup>4</sup> I have enumerated most of these in my *Study of the Perlesvaus*, pp. 43-48. Pending the publication of the Hatton MS, with critical notes, I may here add the following details.

The slaying of Arthur's squire, Chaos, by invisible hands, should be compared to Pseudo-Wauchier, *vas*. 19810 ff., and especially to the *Huth Merlin*, I, 275, this being a common induction motive; see A. C. L. Brown, "The Bleeding Lance," *Publ. of the Mod. Lang. Assoc.*, XXV (1910), 43. The Black Knight whom the king vanquishes carries a burning lance, the flame of which can only be quenched in blood, and the king's own wound must be cured with the Black Knight's blood. This is a clear parallel to the two stories treated by Brown and to the healing of Pelles in the *Demanda* (Brown, p. 48), though in our text Arthur is not wounded *letaliter* as in Geoffrey. As Brown has pointed out, the Irish Luin of Celtchar was such a burning weapon. That the candlestick

fixion,<sup>1</sup> the monastic arrangements it describes,<sup>2</sup> the topography of the story—with Wales, Pannenoisance and Tintagel in the foreground—the prominence given to Loholt (Welsh Llacheu), son of

which is the original reason for the Black Knight's dispute has ritualistic significance is altogether probable (cf. Peebles, *The Legend of Longinus*, p. 67, and Weston, *Romania*, XLIII [1914], 408); Arthur presents the candlestick to the newly founded Church of St. Paul in London.

At the Chapel of St. Austin [Augustine] Arthur is urged to *esfacier la mauvaie loi et essaucier la loi qui est renouellée par le crucefiement du seint prophete*. This gives the keynote to the entire work and explains its proselyting character; whence it is eminently fitted to serve as an exhortation to a crusader like Jean de Nesle (see below). This spirit is apparent also in Arthur's visit to the Grail (Potvin, p. 250). Here the King is welcomed by Perceval and is instructed concerning the "chalice" and the "bell," which the text says were previously unknown in Britain. The "bell" is explained as a gift brought from the *terra repromissionis* by priests who bear the name of Gregory. Thus by a series of hints Gregory, St. Augustine, and St. Paul's in London are linked up with Arthur and Glastonbury, and the British conversion story is made complete.

Although the Lance is inferentially that of Longinus (whose name does not occur, Potvin, p. 2), and the Grail sword is identified with that with which St. John was beheaded, it is all the more noteworthy that the Grail itself is not yet the cup of the Last Supper, as in Robert de Boron, nor does Joseph himself come to Glastonbury.

Inferentially, again, Perceval descends on the maternal side from Joseph's sister, since Perceval is the sister's son of the Fisher-King. On the paternal side he descends from Nicodemus, the ancestor of Glais and Alain (see my *Study*, p. 110). One detail in this connection requires correction: *Je vi le Graal, fait li mestres, avant que li Rois Peschieres Joseph, qui ces onques fu, receulli le sanc Jhesu-Christ*, was misinterpreted by Heinzel and myself to mean that Joseph was already called the "Fisher-King." The passage, correctly interpreted by Evans (see also the other MSS and Miss Weston, *op. cit.*, p. 411), should read: *Je vi le Graal, fait li mestres, avant que le roi Pescheur. Joseph, qui ses oncles fu, recueilli le sanc Jhesu-Christ*. The Grail lineage is matriarchal (*Modern Philology*, IX [1912], 291).

Lastly, an excellent example of the Christianizing spirit is the sealed heads which the Damsel of the Car carries about (Potvin, p. 27); cf. Rev. 7:3: "till we have sealed the servants of our God on their foreheads. And I heard the number of them which were sealed, a hundred and forty thousand, sealed out of every tribe of Israel."

<sup>1</sup> See my *Study*, p. 36. MS B.N.f. 120 begins the *Perlesvaus* section with a miniature of the crucifixion. As Heinzel correctly states (*op. cit.*, 179): "Er [der Grail] erhält Beziehung zum Messopfer, zur Transsubstantiation, der Dreieinigkeit, als etwas dem Kelch mit Wein Aehnliches ja sogar—zum Theil—als etwas demselben Gleichwertiges, wenn auch nicht Gleiches . . . dadurch wird er auch mit der Hostie verbunden, zu der er schlecht passt." "Was die Grallitteratur anlangt, so hat der Gedanke besonders den Verfasser des *Perlesvaus* beschäftigt" (p. 103). This point is missed by Miss Fisher in her *Mystic Vision in the Grail Legend* (New York, 1917)—though she is quite right in claiming that metonymy was practiced by contemporary theologians; cf. Baldwin of Canterbury, *Liber de sacramento altaris* (Migne, CCIV, 772): "Continens pro contento, calix pro sanguine, quia in calice sanguis. Calix in Scriptura pluribus modis accipitur." A careful reading of the *Perlesvaus* would have shown Miss Fisher (p. 78) that the eucharistic miracle of the Christ of St. Gregory is primarily made use of by our author, the *Grand*

<sup>2</sup> Heinzel (172) is again right in connecting our romance with the *Peregrinatio sancti Brandani abbatis*, ed. Schröder, pp. 14 ff.; cf. Zimmer, "Brendans Meerfahrt" in the *Zeitsch. für deut. Alt.*, XXXIII (1889). Potvin, p. 250 mentions the *terra de promission* (*terra repromissionis*) which the Brendan makes so much of; cf. Schröder, pp. 4, 6, 35, 36, also 27 where Brendan finds the *calicem in genere conopei et patenam de colore columpne*. See also Nutt, *Studies in the Legend of the Holy Grail*, p. 264.

Arthur,<sup>1</sup> etc., are features that fit in admirably with this conclusion.

But it does not necessarily follow that the first redaction, if there existed a "first" redaction, was in Latin, as our text says and as Baist (*Prorektoratsrede*, p. 15) maintains:

Wir besitzen jene Erzählung, welche die Gattung der christlich-mythischen Ritterromane inauguriert, nicht mehr in ihrer ersten lateinischen Gestalt, sondern nur in einer schlechten altfranzösischen Prosaübersetzung, deren Überlieferungsfehler wesentlich die Schuld daran tragen, dass man die Bedeutung von Glastonbury für die Fortbildung der Gralmaterie verkannt hat. Auf Grund jenes lateinischen Romans unternahm gegen 1200 ein Anglo-normanne Robert von Boron eine neue Graldichtung.

It is true that the romance speaks consistently of Joseph of Arimathea as "*Joseph d'Abarimacie*," a form clearly modeled on the Latin *ab Arimathia*; cf. the *De Antiquitate*:

carissimum amicum suum Joseph ab Arimathia.

*St. Graal* and the *Queste* following in his wake. Compare Potvin, pp. 87-89, where Gauvain first has visions of a chalice in the Grail, *dont il ni iert geires a iceat tens*, then of the figure of a child, and finally of a king nailed to the cross. Similarly, at the Chapel of St. Austin Arthur sees the Virgin offer a child to the hermit celebrating the mass; the passage in *Johannis Glastoniensis* (I, 79) being but another version of this episode (*Modern Philology*, I, 248): "sacerdos vero eum collocavit super corporale, juxta calicem. Cum autem prevenisset ad immolationem hostiae, id est, ad verba Dominica, *Hoc est enim corpus meum*, elevavit puerum in manibus suis." Lastly, when Arthur (Potvin, p. 173) is at the island of the monks he beholds the Grail at mass in five different forms, the last of which is as a chalice. It is obvious that without actually identifying Grail and chalice, the author of our romance wished to suggest that the British acquired the use of the chalice from Arthur's vision of it in the Grail since the text remarks: "the estoire saith not that there were no chalices elsewhere, but that in all Great Britain and in the whole kingdom was none. Arthur was right glad of this that he had seen, and had in remembrance the name and the fashion of the most holy chalice."

Among the contemporaries of our author, the Chronicle of Robert of Torigni (Rolls Series, 1889), begun by Robertus de Monte Michaelis (to give him his real name) and continued by others down to the reign of King John, gives various examples of St. Gregory's miracle under the entry of 1181-1182. Robert records the miracle for Chartres, Angers, and Fécamp: "Hoc etiam accidit quidam sanctissimo presbytero juxta Fiscanum, dum canteret missam in die dedicationis ecclesiae Sanctae Trinitatis Fiscanni." On Fécamp and its Holy Blood legend, see Miss Weston, *Legend of Sir Perceval*, I, 155 ff., and II, 268 ff. Miss Weston, it may be said incidentally, is correct in saying that "the two abbeys [Fécamp and Glastonbury], both Benedictine foundations, enjoyed the patronage of the same princes" and were otherwise related. Nevertheless, she has hardly proved that "the (Grail) story which in its original form (now practically lost) was developed at Fescamp, was later worked over in the interests of Glastonbury." This statement, in my judgment, is mainly assumption. On the other hand, what brought the Grail into relation with Glastonbury was (1) the accounts of the tomb of King Arthur, and (2) the founding of St. Mary's as related in the *De Antiquitate* (Newell, p. 466) by the twelve disciples of Philip, though, as Newell (p. 468) shows, the *De Antiquitate* nowhere states that Joseph himself came to Glastonbury—this being another point of agreement with the *Perlesvaus* which Miss Weston (II, 269) fails to observe.

<sup>1</sup> The *Perlesvaus* also mentions Cardoil. E. Freymond, *Zeitsch. für französ. Sprache und Litt.*, XVII (1895), 12, shows that the author of the *Livre d'Artus* (B.N.f. 337) apparently knew the story of Loholt's death and Kay's treachery from our romance (Potvin, pp. 169 and 219).

Moreover, Suchier—whose view that Robert de Boron was an Anglo-Norman<sup>1</sup> Baist is repeating—was of the opinion that the *vaus d'Avoron* (compare the *grant vallée* in the *Perlesvaus*) in Robert came from a Latin source: "Verfasser eines verlorenen lateinischen Gralbuches." Furthermore, we might expect a Glastonbury monk to use Latin rather than French: the *De Ortu Walwani* and the *Vita Meriadoci*, by Robert de Torigni, are examples of twelfth-century Arthurian stories in Latin by a monk of Mont St. Michel, and unimportant as they are for the main Arthurian tradition, one of them (the first) is closely related to the account of Gauvain's birth given in our text.<sup>2</sup> It is also noteworthy that the revised *De Antiquitate* uses the phrase: *legitur in gestis illustrissimi regis Arthuri*, which Baist (*Zeitsch. für roman. Phil.*, XIX, 340) has compared to the *testatur liber de gestis incliti regis Arthuri* found in *Johannis Glastoniensis*;<sup>3</sup> and, above all, that the initial episode of Arthur and the chapel is recounted by *Johannis Glastoniensis* in Latin as a distinct story, without any reference to St. Austin or Perceval or the Grail; the probability thus being that *Johannis* used a variant of this episode that is antecedent to the form found in our romance.<sup>4</sup>

On the other hand, to affirm that the original *Perlesvaus* was French is not to affirm that the author did not use Latin sources;

<sup>1</sup> *Zeitsch. für roman. Phil.*, XVI, 270, and *Französische Literaturgeschichte*, p. 132. As Foerster, *Wörterbuch*, p. 168,\* points out, the rimes of Robert's *Joseph* reveal a curious language mixture. At the same time, Foerster admits that the numerous *é:ie* rimes are striking, "die wir in solcher Häufigkeit nur in England kennen, so dass wir unwillkürlich an England denken, um so mehr, als die Gralgeschichte sich in England abwickelt und der Gral von Jerusalem nach England gekommen sein muss." Newell (*op. cit.*, p. 511) thinks that Robert's poem "may exhibit the influence of the revised edition" of the *De Antiquitate*; certainly Newell is right in thinking that the expression *vaus d'Avoron*, the low-lying and desolate district in the West, "can apply only to Glastonbury." Brugger, *Zeitsch. für französ. Sprache und Litt.*, XXIX, p. 71, believes that for the "early history" of the Grail Robert had a Glastonbury source: "Es war eine vermuthlich von den Mönchen von Glastonbury erfundene oder wenigstens von denselben ausgebeutete christliche Legende, wahrscheinlich ursprünglich in lateinischer Prosa abgefasst (Robert mag sich aber einer französischen Übersetzung bedient haben)." Apparently this would be the *grant liere* to which Robert refers (vs. 932). Heinzel (p. 86), far more prudent, says: "Dass er [Robert] von einem Werke weiss und es nicht kennt, kann gewiss wahr sein."

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Margaret Shove Morris, *Publ. of the Mod. Lang. Assoc.*, XXIII (1908), 634, who makes it extremely probable that the *Perlesvaus* is here indebted directly to the *De Ortu Walwani*.

<sup>3</sup> Hearne's edition (Oxford, 1726), pp. 55 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Hearne, pp. 77 ff.; see my article in *Modern Philology*, I, 2 ff. I give the text below.

he obviously did. The *Perlesvaus* is not the only Grail work to claim a Latin original. The so-called *Grand St. Graal* claims to be a translation *de latin en franchois, après celui hermite à qui nostres sires le livra premierement* (Hucher III, p. 102). Yet the monk Helinand, who studied at Beauvais, and who wrote before 1216,<sup>1</sup> says:

hanc historiam latine scriptam invenire non potui,

and he then proceeds to remark that there is much on the subject written in French. It is strange, to say the least, that if the Grail works had existed in a Latin form no remnants from the Latin should have been accessible in Helinand's day. There is no evidence that the *gesta regis Arturi* of the *De Antiquitate* referred to the Grail; nor need it have been in Latin (cf. Gaston Paris, *Hist. litt.*, XXX, 200, who considered it Anglo-Norman). To be sure, *Johannis Glastoniensis* says:

Joseph ab Armathia [*sic*], nobilem decurionem, cum filio suo, Josephes dicto, & aliis pluribus, in Majorem Britanniam, quae nunc Anglia dicta est, venisse, & ibidem vitam finisse, testatur *liber de gestis incliti regis Arthuri*;

but from this and subsequent remarks of *Johannis* it is obvious that the text referred to a form of the Graal-Lancelot cycle and not to a *Perlesvaus*.<sup>2</sup> Finally, the version of the Arthur and chapel episode which *Johannis* quotes<sup>3</sup> has all the earmarks of a local Glastonbury legend which could not have been derived by *Johannis* from any form of the *Perlesvaus* whether Latin or French. In proof of which fact the following details are sufficient: Arthur, who is sojourning at a nunnery in *Wirale* (that is, Weary-All-Hill in Glastonbury) has a vision in which an angel urges him to go to a hermitage of Mary Magdalen *de Bekeri* (that is, the Island of Beckery at Glastonbury).

<sup>1</sup> Cf. J. D. Bruce, *Romanic Review*, III (1912), 188.

<sup>2</sup> See *Modern Philology*, I (1903), 248, note; also *Johannis Glastoniensis*, p. 55.

<sup>3</sup> See Appendix, below, for the text of *Johannis*. The version of the Grail story cited by Miss Weston from the *Sone de Nansay* in *Romania*, XLIII (1914), 403 ff., seems to me a composite version in which the *Perlesvaus* was used (cf. Weston, p. 411) together with other sources, including Crestien. The *Sone* is a typical roman d'aventure with borrowings from Arthurian romances. Miss Weston's conclusion that the original of the *Sone* version of the Grail story was identical with the source of Gerbert's Continuation, which source in turn was identical with Crestien's *livre*, i.e., Count Philip's book, confuses rather than clarifies the problem. Bruce (*Publ. of the Mod. Lang. Assoc.*, XV [1909], 336) calls attention to a resemblance between the *Sone de Nansay* and the *Vita Meriadoci* of Robert of Torigni; see also Foerster, *Charrete*, pp. xlix ff.



Then follows the well-known adventure of the squire and the gift of the candlestick that he has stolen to Westminster Abbey (in the *Perlesvaus*, to St. Paul's in London). This results in Arthur's going alone. When he reaches the chapel there is great conflict within. As soon as this subsides he enters and the miracle of St. Gregory takes place. Before he leaves the Virgin gives him a crystal cross, which is still preserved in Glastonbury. Arthur then resolves to amend his ways and always to believe in the holy sacrament. In honor of the Virgin and the crystal cross he changes the emblems on his armor. Obviously, Johannis and the author of the *Perlesvaus* derived this story from a common source. This common source the author of the *Perlesvaus* connected with the conversion of the British by St. Augustine (hence the Chapel of St. Austin) and with the Grail legend (hence the damsel who informs Arthur of Perceval's failure, according to Crestien).

Thus, it seems to me clear that while the extant *Perlesvaus* contains unmistakable evidence of a direct Glastonbury influence, and although it is possible to narrow this influence down to a period not too long after 1191, when the Glastonbury propaganda was at its height, yet there is no compelling reason for supposing that the romance once existed as such in an earlier Latin form. The assumption of a Latin original, in which, according to Baist, Crestien's *Perceval* was incorporated, and from which, according to Suchier, Robert de Boron derived material for his *Joseph*, is a convenient hypothesis, but for the present it seems wise to regard it as little more.<sup>1</sup> We may be certain that the romance drew in part on Latin sources, but that it originally had a Latin form we may seriously doubt. The demands of the case are amply satisfied by referring the expression *Li latins de coi cist estoires fust traite an romanz* to Glastonbury records about Arthur as preserved in chronicle sources.

So, too, it is impossible to say whether or not the *Perlesvaus* was composed in Glastonbury itself. It is not improbable that it was written in England by one close to the Welsh border—the topography of the story and the borrowing in *Fulk Fitz Warin*

<sup>1</sup> Robert de Boron may have got his hint from the *De Antiquitate*, as Newell suggests. Possibilities are plentiful. In Higden, *Polychronicon* v. 332, Arthur is said to be buried in *valle Avalloniae juxta Glastoniam*; cf. Robert's *sauz d'Asaron*.



would indicate as much.<sup>1</sup> Yet the validity of such an inference will depend ultimately on what an extensive test of the language of the MSS will reveal. Certainly none of the extant MSS antedate the middle of the thirteenth century; at the same time, MS B is surely not the original as it lacks part of an episode which is complete in O and P.<sup>2</sup> The *Chevalier as Deus Espees*, vs. 2604 mentions:

Et Perceval le fil Alain,  
Le gros Desuaus de Kamelot,

which manifestly should read:

Et Perceval le fil Alain  
Le Gros, des Vaus de Kamelot,

for this is a specific reference to our work (Potvin, p. 19). As the *Chevalier as Deus Espees* was composed before 1250, the *Perlesvaus* is certainly earlier.<sup>3</sup> Besides, the end of the twelfth century is a priori a more likely date for it than the middle of the thirteenth. But this brings us to the second part of our inquiry: the problem involved in statement (c) of the Brussels text.

WILLIAM A. NITZE

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

[To be continued]

<sup>1</sup> The cannibalistic traits of King Gurgalain, from whom Gawain procured the sword of St. John (Potvin, p. 75) recall vividly the Gwrgi Garwlwyd of the Welsh *Triads*; cf. Loth, *Mabinogion*, II, 233, 288: Trois traîtres dans l'âme, qui furent cause que les Saxons enlevèrent la couronne de l'île de Prydein aux Cymri. L'un fut Gwrgi Garwlwyd, qui, après avoir goûté de la chair humaine à la cour d'Edelfflet, roi des Saxons, en devint si friand qu'il ne mangea plus d'autre viande; c'est pourquoi il s'allia, lui et ses hommes, avec Edelfflet, roi des Saxons. Il faisait de continuelles incursions chez les Cymri et enlevait autant de jeunes gens mâles et femelles qu'il en pouvait manger chaque jour. See also Rhys, *Arthurian Legend*, pp. 73 and 121; also Kittredge, "Arthur and Gorlagon" (*Harvard Studies and Notes*, VIII, 203) and my articles in *Publ. of the Mod. Lang. Assoc.*, XXIV (1909), 408, and *Mod. Lang. Notes* (1910).

<sup>2</sup> On the portion missing from B see my *Study*.

<sup>3</sup> Foerster's edition, p. lxi.

## TWO ARABIC WORDS IN THE ROMANCERO

### 1. ALCARIA

In the "Romance del rey Marsín" (fifteenth century) a Moor, addressing angrily his fellow-combatants who are fleeing before the French, exclaims:

Alcaria, moros, alcaria—si mala rabia vos mate,  
que sois ciento para uno—irles fuyendo delante;  
¡oh mal haya el rey Marsín—que soldada os manda dare;  
mal haya la reina mora—que vos la manda pagare;  
mal hayáis vosotros, moros,—que la venís á ganare!

Professor Griswold Morley, in his *Spanish Ballads*, lists the word *alcaria* in the glossary with a question mark. This seems to be the only occurrence of the word in the *Romancero*.

Taking the context and the repeated *mal haya* as a basis, it would seem plausible to trace the word to a term in Arabic, which would fit the tone of the exclamation and the situation.

At first, the word *al-kariha* ('adversity' or 'peril in war,' from the root *kariha* 'to despise') suggested itself to me as a possible etymon, as it would combine both the idea of disgust at the cowardly attitude of the fleeing Moors and the warning at the impending danger. In discussing the matter with Professor M. Sprengling, however, he suggested *al-qāri'a*, which undoubtedly fits the situation much better. The word is found repeated, in an exclamatory form, three times in succession at the head of a well-known chapter of the Qor'ān (Sūra CIII), which the majority of the Muslims know by heart and often allude to, especially when uttering maledictions against Satan. The general meaning is 'blow,' 'misfortune,' but in its Qoranic application it means 'the final retribution' (i.e., the day of Judgment). As the Moor is speaking of retribution, further on in his harangue, it would seem quite plausible that he should quote the Qoranic *al-qāri'a* to spur his men on.

This etymon is also quite satisfactory from the phonetic point of view; cf. mod. Sp. *alcaria* and *alqueria* (V. Covarrubias s.v. *alcarria*), derived from the Arabic *al-qarya* 'village.'

## 2. ALFÉREZ

In the "Romance de Fajardo" (end of the fifteenth century), the Moorish king is expressing great joy at a good move he had made:

jaque le dió con el roque,—el alférez le prendía.

Juan de Timoneda, in "Rosa española" (1573), corrected this to read *el orfil que le prendía* (*orfil*, mod. *alfil* = 'bishop'). It seems that he was not familiar with the game of chess and knew no Arabic names of the pieces used in it, except *orfil*. His correction is, in any case, quite out of place.

Two interpretations could be attached to the word as a chess term. The first and the most obvious one is that of 'knight' (literally 'horse,' Arab. *al-faras*). In O.Sp. there appears to have existed a confusion between *al-faras* 'horse' and *al-fāris* 'horseman,' 'standard-bearer,' and we find the word spelled both *alférez* and *alfaraz*, in addition to *alfiérez*, *alfierse* (*Poema de Alfonso Onceno*, 1760), *alfierze* (*Libro de Alexandre*, 593), *alfrez*, *alfres*, and *alferce*.

The second interpretation, which would suggest itself by the jubilant attitude of the Moor, is that in this case 'queen' (Arab. *al-ferza*) is meant. Eguilaz (*Glosario*, 166) points out that the names *alferza* and *alférez*, as chess terms, were frequently confused. Chess players will agree with me that in the end-game one can always hope to make a draw, even when a piece down, but hardly so when the opponent captures the queen. The classic Arabic word for queen is *al-firzān* (from the Persian *firzīn*), but in the colloquial Arabic only *al-ferz* or *al-ferza* are used, as are *al-faras* for knight and *al-fil* for bishop, as the writer knows from personal experience when playing the royal game with the 'ulemā of Al-Azhar mosque in Cairo.

A. R. NYKL

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

## REVIEWS AND NOTICES

*A Study of the Writings of D. Mariano José de Larra, 1809-1837.*

By ELIZABETH MCGUIRE. University of California Publications in Modern Philology, VII, 2. Pp. 87+130.

This study will serve excellently as an introduction for those beginning acquaintance with Larra. Those familiar with his writings will find in it little that is new. The author attempts a critical estimate of Larra as a writer, backing her judgments with copious quotation from his works. She has obviously been unable to consult certain important sources. Her most original contribution is that section of the work dealing with the French originals of many of Larra's plays. With regard to the question as to which of the three, Larra, Mesonero, or Estébanez Calderón, was first in the field as a *costumbrista*, Miss McGuire appears to accept the judgments of Cánovas del Castillo. This controversy should never have arisen, for Mesonero with *Mis ratos perdidos* clearly was many years in advance of his two rivals in this genre. That Mesonero was influenced by Jouy is evident from the most cursory reading of the former's writings. His many allusions to the French author suggest that he had no intent to conceal this indebtedness.

G. T. NORTHUP

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

*F. D'Ovidio e W. Meyer-Lübke, Grammatica storica della lingua e dei dialetti italiani*, tradotta per cura di E. POLCARI. Milano: Hoepli, 1919. Pp. 303. L. 6.50.

Gröber's *Grundriss* has long been appreciated as a work of great value for persons interested in Romanic philology. By translating into Italian the portion dealing with literary Italian and the various dialects of Italy, Polcari has helped in spreading a knowledge of linguistic matters among those who might not otherwise make any use of the *Grundriss*. This second edition differs from the first mainly in regard to the bibliographic notes. It is to be regretted that the text was not carefully revised; what is worth doing is worth doing well. It was reasonable to present the first edition as a simple translation, made from the newly revised German text. But nothing can justify leaving the book almost unchanged, as if Romanic philology had not progressed in the last twelve years. I will mention some details that might be improved.

P. 2: written *j* is said to be unknown initially; but *jeri* is given as a variant of *ieri* on p. 10. P. 3: *j* is said to be named *i longa*. P. 4: Italian is said to admit eye-rimes only where written *e* or *o* is involved; but from 169]

p. 6 we learn that they may also be hidden under the ambiguity of written *s* or *z*. P. 5: if the translator understands *la nasale indeterminata*, he should reveal the secret; otherwise he ought to leave out the remarks about it. It is absurd to speak of *r* as being *gutturale*, *come nel francese e nel tedesco*: French and German students should be warned against using the so-called guttural (velar) *r* in Italian. The use of a dotted or tailed *z*, in teaching Italian to natives, is better than the bare orthography, but *ts* and *dz* should be used in systematic transcriptions. With regard to the sounds, it is unreasonable to say that the occlusive and fricative elements are simultaneous (p. 6). P. 9, bottom: *hj* is a mistake for *kj*. P. 11: *deño* should be changed to *deñño*, and *denñji* to *deññi*. P. 13: is there any sound of *j* in *ciò* and *già*? P. 20: two commas, not five, are needed in *e tu, a te, da Roma*. P. 21: in the transcriptions stress should be marked systematically. P. 27: *Skizzen lebender Sprachen* is the name of a series; the title of Panconcelli-Calzia's work is needed (*Italiano nelle S. l. S. del Viëtor*). P. 31: *pio* belongs in § 15, with *pria* and *via*. P. 37: indirect *i* (through *e*) in *ciglio*, *lingua*, *tinca*, is implied by *o* in *moglie* and *tronco*. P. 38: *camicia* is normal, not bookish, early *š* having the same closing effect as *ñ* in the derivative of *tinea*. P. 41: Tuscan stressless *e* is regularly close, so that *nevicare* does not explain the change of *nève* to *nève*, *nieve*; the latter came from the influence of *lève*, *lieve*. P. 44: contact with a following *j* changed open *i* to close *i*, but did not generally affect close *e*. Dialectal *dito-deta* could have come from inflections of the type *sikko-sikki* (with harmonic closure) beside *sekka-sekke*; in southern Italy there is a widespread change of close *e* to *i*. Otherwise the derivatives of *digitus* indicate the relative chronology of *pera* < *pira* and *\*rejes* < *rêgēs*. Where the *e* of *pera* was developed earlier than the *j* of *\*rejes*, *\*déjeto* kept *é*. Where *j* < *g* was earlier than stressed *e* < *i*, it produced *dilo* < *\*dijeto*. P. 45: dissimilation cannot reasonably be assumed for *freddo*. In Hispanic, where *flaccidus* produced *\*ricidus* we find a normal treatment of *frigidus*; in Italy and France it adopted the stressed vowel of *rigidus*. P. 46: *carena* was borrowed from early Genoese *\*kařēna* or *\*kařeŋna*. P. 50: the short *e* of *-endo* (beside *-ēre*) was developed by checking, as in *uēntus* < *\*wēntos*, rather than by the influence of *-endo* (*-ēre*). P. 51: the open *e* of *spero* may have come from *spem*. Stressless *\*deet* (afterward re-stressed) was formed from *dēbet* so early that the *e* necessarily became short and open; the re-stressed *è* has replaced historic *é* in *deve*. P. 52: the *i* of *biscia* came from *uīpera*. P. 33: in the derivative of *dirigere*, contact with *j* produced close *i*, which was extended to *diritto*. P. 56: a re-stressing of weak forms explains *bene*, *era*, *sei*; there is no reason for thinking that *sei* came from *siei*. P. 60: Sicilian *ntinna* and Tuscan *antēnna* show that the Latin word had long *e*. P. 61: the influence of *mulier* caused a stress-change in *\*mulière*; the derivatives prove that *i* kept its stress in *\*parite*. The loss of *pariēs* allowed *parietem* to be treated normally, in accord with *altra* < *altera*. P. 63: it is absurd to

put *iuncus* under *ū* and then say in a foot note that it had *ū*. P. 64: Latin *lucta* had short *u*; the early fronting of  $\chi$  produced close *u* in most of the western derivatives.<sup>1</sup> P. 67: *lupo* is (like French *loup* and Latin *lupus*) a dialectal form. In central and northern Italy, vowel-harmony changed \**lōpi* or \**lōbi* to *lupi*, \**lubi*. "Rimane *u* in iato" is a misleading statement; open *ɹ* has become close. P. 68: I think *unqua* and *-unque* are bookish, beside normal *tronco*, although harmonic changes of stressed vowels are found in some of the Tuscan dialects and may have left traces in literary Italian. Genoese *fonzo* (*funzu*) has analogic *z* from normal *fonzi* < *fungi*; likewise Tuscan *fungo* has borrowed *u* from the derivative of *fungi*. We may assume changes in the following order: (1) *ñ* for the  $\eta$  of *fungi*, (2) *ó* for the *ù* of *gula*, *truncus*, *uncia*, (3) *ñ* for the  $\eta$  of \**ōnkea* or \**ōnkia*. The *u* of *unghia* probably shows that the  $\eta$  of \**ūngla* was palatalized enough to modify open *u*; dialectal *onghia* indicates either a lack of such palatalization or a later development (after \**ūngla* became \**ōngla*). Thus *ungo* is analogic, like *fungo*, and dialectal *ongere* is presumably analogic, based on the normal derivative of Latin *ungo*. Latin had *ū* in analogic *unctus* and *ū* in normal \**ūntus* (parallel with *ī* in *quīntus*), so that *unto* may be both analogic and normal. From *pugno* and *vergogna* it is clear that *o* in *gola* was developed earlier than *ññ* from *ndi*, but later than *ññ* from  $\eta\eta$  (written *gn*). Open *u* was subject to *ñ*-influence, while close *o* was not. P. 69: *fugge* developed normal *ú* from *ù* by contact with *j*. *Perugia* and *Peroscia* belong to different dialects: in one the *o* of *gola* was formed later than *š*, in the other one earlier. P. 70: Sardinian dialects vary between *u*-forms and *o*-forms, in equivalents of the suffix *-occhio*, showing that the Latin *ū* was sometimes changed to *ō*. The *o* came from the influence of *oculus*. If the *ō* of \**eskōtere* did not come from \**estorkere*, we may assume a compromise between *exculere* and *quātere*. P. 72: the *o* of *cognitus* was short. P. 74: the *ō* of Germanic 'knot' is represented in Milanese *næt*, Parmese *næd*, Tuscan *nōdo*. The *u* of *cruna* may have come from Genoese, where *u* < *ō* is normal. In the derivatives of \**lowetos* (and of \**lowetos*) the loss of *e* produced *ou*, which normally became *ū*; the change of *e* to *o* gave *ō*, with *w* lost between similar vowels as in *uīta* < \**wīwīlā*. P. 75: *oriuolo* was developed through \**orojōlo*, not \**horgiolo*; and *ariento* came from a form with a vowel between *r* and *g*. P. 83: it is unreasonable to question *bue* < \**buoe* after admitting *mio* < \**mīeo*. There is no ground for assuming a long *o* in \**boe*; the inflection of *bōs* \**boe* was modeled on *sūs*-*sue*. The *u* of *spugna* comes from some southern dialect having normal *u* for close *o*, probably Sicilian, the sponge-trade being largely in the hands of Sicilians. Latin *o* before  $\eta$  was abnormal: *lungi* developed normally from a variant of *longē* having *u* instead of *o*. P. 89: *Paolo* is bookish; *cavolo* came from Neapolitan. P. 111: there was no general change of *eve* to *ee*; *bee* shows dissimilation, *dee* is a stressless development, and *prete* is connected with French *prêtre* or Latin *praetor*. The *š* of *vescica*

<sup>1</sup> *Modern Language Review*, XIV, 106.

came from *uezāre*. P. 117: *lj* gives *λλ*, not simply *λ*, at least after a stressed vowel.

With regard to morphology little needs to be said. I think the *è* of *ebbe* and *seppe* came from *stette*. The pronoun *mia* is presumably *mē ad* or *mihi ad*, based on *mēcum*. Northern *ghe* could have been constructed from phrases like *i ga < hīc habet*, *i gaveva < hīc habēbat*, parallel with Venetian (*i*) *xe < hīc est*. The reference to Menger's work (p. 168), with nothing but its date and the title in near-English to localize it, would be more useful if the source had been given: *Pub. Mod. Lang. Association*, Vol. VIII.

The section dealing with the dialects suffers from the author's failure to represent sounds systematically. Thus we find on p. 175 the Sardinian words *kelu*, *kingere* (meaning *kingere*), and *cunoskere*: these are indexed by the translator as *chelu* and *kelu*, *chingere* (not under *k*), *cunoskere* (why not with *ch* for *k*?), showing that he has misread *kingere* with *ndž* instead of *ng*. Especially unfortunate is the use of *z* for *ts* and for *dz*, with nothing to distinguish the two values. The velar fricative *χ* is sometimes written *χ*; but *h* is used for *χ* in *ihhala* 'scala' (p. 178), while the silent *h* of *hapu* (p. 176) is written in imitation of literary *ho*. Equally absurd is *laygu* 'largo' (p. 178) for *layyu*, *y* being used elsewhere with the same value as *j*. In a new edition all dialect-forms should be given, if possible, in transcription and in ordinary spelling, as *kingere* (*chinghere*). The reader should learn not only that *ā* comes from *a* combined with *e* in Genoese; he should be told also that *ā* is the author's symbol for open *ē*, and that the *ā* of Genoese spelling means long *a*. A few serious mistakes need correcting, as *šou* (p. 219) for Genoese *šū* (*sciō*) < *flōrem*, *žuven* (p. 218) for Genoese *zuvenu* (*zovenno*) < *iūuenem*. On p. 103 (and likewise in § 34 of Bertoni's *Italia dialettale*), Milanese is represented as having kept stressed close *o*: Professor Salvioni has kindly informed me that the sound is really *u*.

E. H. TUTTLE

NORTH HAVEN, CONN.

*Grammaire élémentaire de l'Ancien Français.* PAR JOSEPH ANGLADE.

Paris: Armand Colin, 1918. Pp. viii+275. 4 fr.

This book is the résumé of an elementary course given during the war and is intended for beginners, some of whom feel discouraged in the start because "les longs ouvrages leur font peur." It consists of three parts: *Phonétique* (pp. 1-74), *Morphologie* (pp. 75-154), *Syntaxe* (pp. 155-269). The chief difficulty in preparing an introductory book on Old French is to know what to eliminate from the vast quantity of material at hand, without, however, eliminating too much. To the author's credit it must be said that he has for the most part overcome this difficulty. The morphology and the syntax are adequately treated, but the phonology, which is the part for



which beginners evince the greatest interest, would be of greater value if more information concerning phonetic problems, and at times more examples, were given. On the whole M. Anglade must be congratulated for the care and clearness with which he has presented the subject matter.

A few suggestions may be made. Page 78: the forms of the article *aus* < *als* and *au* < *al* are explained, the former by vocalization, and the latter by analogy; *al* may have become *au* when placed before a word beginning with a consonant, however, and *aus* may be by analogy to the singular *au*. No mention is made of the older and more often used *as*. P. 110: the future forms *enterrai* for *entrerai*, *juerrai* for *jurera*, due to metathesis, and *donrai* for *donnerai* due to assimilation, illustrate phonetic phenomena and are not merely contractions. P. 113: *enverrai* may be by analogy to *verrai*. P. 144: the perfect *fui* according to M.A. "est devenu *fus* par analogie des autres parfaits en *us*," but the form *us* of other perfects is not explained in the book; it may not be necessary to suppose *fus* to be an analogical form, and, on the contrary, it may have been the starting point for the other forms of its own tense and also for other perfects as some scholars believe. P. 166: M. Anglade considers the partitive article *del*, *de la*, *des* as "très rare dans l'ancienne langue (on n'en trouve pas d'exemple au XI<sup>e</sup> siècle)"; the partitive, however, is already found in germ in the *Chanson de Roland* 2345-2348, according to Gaston Paris (*Extraits*, § 109); Brunot thinks it "déjà très fréquent dans le *Roman de Troie*"; other instances appear in *Aucassin et Nicolette*: 26, 13; 2, 32; 4, 13 (cf. Brunot, *Histoire*, I, p. 235). P. 17: the accusative form *martel* is given erroneously as a *mot d'emprunt*. P. 63: *encre* could be added after *enque*. P. 64: the treatment of *h* of Germanic or of Latin origin might have been allowed more space. Pp. 64-67: no examples illustrate the group *GI*; the groups *SSI* and *RI* are not mentioned. P. 154: to explain *da* in the interjection *oui-da* the intermediary form *dea* (from *di-va*?) could be given.

In the Syntax most of the quotations are taken from the *Vie de Saint Alexis* and the *Chanson de Roland*; they are followed by a translation into modern French and are for the most part well-chosen. At times, however, they are given without mentioning the authors' specific works from which they are derived. Thus, p. 187: *Malherbe*, *Corneille*; p. 223: *Balzac*, *La Bruyère*. On p. 246 a quotation appears without the author's name. In such a work a direct reference, or else a list of the books used for quotations, ought to be given. I have noted fourteen quotations taken from the *Roland* which fail to tally with the exact numbering of the lines.

In order to make this otherwise clearly written book more serviceable and practical to beginners, its subject-matter should be divided into numbered sections which would indicate accurately the place of the topic, do away with unsatisfactory *infra* and *supra*, and, in passing, save time. The index or table of contents is not adequate, and there is no index of the Old French words contained in the book. The bibliography is intentionally

short, consequently ambitious students will have to consult other grammars for further information.

HENRY E. HAXO

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH DAKOTA

*Sources of the Religious Element in Flaubert's "Salammbô."* By ARTHUR HAMILTON. *Elliott Monographs No. 4.* Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1917. Pp. xi+123.

This is the fourth of a group of studies of Flaubert begun at Johns Hopkins University under the direction of Professor Adolphe Terracher (now of Liverpool) during his stay in America. The first to appear had to do with the *Œuvres de jeunesse*, the third with the composition of *Salammbô* traced through the author's letters, the second, like the one before us, with the sources and structure of the novel. Dr. Fay studied with great care the debt of Flaubert to Polybius' history of the revolt of the mercenaries (*Elliott Monographs No. 2*), and Dr. Hamilton has diligently sought the sources for the religious element, important both in the structure of the tale and in the general setting of its scenes. No product of Flaubert's pen betrays more clearly than the religious passages in *Salammbô* the romanticist seeing through the realist's eye. The descriptions of the temples of Tanit and of Moloch, for example, are built up objectively, realistically, but only a romantic fancy would have dwelt on those details of their mysteries that Flaubert chose to throw into relief. It is not surprising that the archaeologist Froehner should have been reminded of *Hernani* when reading the account of the council meeting in the temple of Baal (*Revue contemporaine* [1862], p. 853).

Flaubert's letters from 1857 to 1862 contain many references to the authorities he was using to reconstruct Carthaginian civilization; Abrami's notes to the Conard edition of *Salammbô* reproduce much information from the author's papers; and Flaubert's letters to Sainte-Beuve and to Froehner, written in response to their criticisms of the historical element in the book, give numerous details about his sources. These works served Dr. Hamilton as his point of departure, and as a result of his investigations we now have access to the texts of the passages from which Flaubert drew almost all the facts, or pseudo-facts, for the religious element of the novel.

It is interesting to learn where the novelist found his material. His chief source was Creuzer, *Les Religions de l'antiquité*, a translation of a four-volume German work; next in importance were the *Recherches sur la topographie de Carthage*, by Dureau de la Malle; then comes a long list containing, among others, Pliny's *Natural History*, various *Mémoires* of the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, Heeren's *De la Politique et du commerce des peuples de l'antiquité*, Polybius, Plutarch, Diodorus, Lucian, Silius Italicus, Herodotus, Vitruvius, and Cahen's translation of the Bible. It is easy to understand Flaubert's complaints in letters of the period: "J'accumule notes sur notes, livres sur livres. . . . Je bâche comme un nègre. . . . J'ai bien

avalé depuis le 1er février une cinquantaine de volumes" . . . (*Correspondance*, III, 144, 146, 240). His aim he expressed thus: "Quant à l'archéologie, elle sera 'probable.' Voilà tout. Pourvu que l'on ne puisse me *prouver* que j'ai dit des absurdités, c'est tout ce que je demande" (p. 151). How seriously to heart he took this element of his novel is indicated by his vigorous defense of its accuracy in his replies to Sainte-Beuve and to Froehner, while admitting frankly the book's shortcomings; yet his prime motive was of course artistic and literary. In 1857 he had written: "Je donnerais la demi-rame de notes que j'ai écrites depuis cinq mois et les quatre vingt dix-huit volumes que j'ai lus pour être pendant trois secondes seulement réellement ému par la passion de mes héros" (p. 151), and after the five-year long effort he exclaimed to Sainte-Beuve: "Je crois avoir fait quelque chose qui ressemble à Carthage. Mais ce n'est pas la question. Je me moque de l'archéologie! Si la couleur n'est pas une, si les détails détonnent, si les mœurs ne dérivent pas de la religion et les faits des passions . . . , s'il n'y a pas, en un mot, harmonie, je suis dans le faux. . . . Tout se tient" (p. 343).

In his Introduction, Dr. Hamilton points out that the story revolves about the struggle between Tanit and Moloch for supremacy in Carthage, and that the religious element is consequently as much a part of the structure of the book as is the historical basis drawn from Polybius. Salammbô and Matho suggest in some sort to each other the two divinities, the moon and the sun. Salammbô sins involuntarily against Tanit. In her effort to save the sacred veil for Carthage she seals her own doom (p. 414), and Moloch destroys Matho and the Barbarians for taking arms against the city consecrated to his worship. In fact Dr. Hamilton might have indicated more explicitly that what endures from all this welter of destruction is the race, the city protected by the two divine principles, and that the individuals caught in the cross-currents of the influences that threaten the existence of the favored people cannot do other than perish miserably. This harmonizes with the general determinism to be found elsewhere in Flaubert.

One example of the results of Dr. Hamilton's study of a particular problem is all that can be given here. The letter to Sainte-Beuve names six sources for the description of the temple of Tanit (*Salammbô*, chap. v): Lucian, *De la Déesse syrienne*; the temples at Jerusalem, Gozzo, Thugga; St. Jerome; and the medallions of the duke of Luynes. The debt to the first three is undoubted, but the coins in question were not placed on exhibition until 1862, and it was the reproductions in Creuzer and Lajard that actually gave the details. Flaubert used, further, Pliny, Philostratus, Pausanias, Quatremère (in the *Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions*), Lucian's *Amours*, Renan, Dureau de la Malle, Dufour (*Histoire de la prostitution*), Abbé Mignot, Strabo, and the *De Diis Syris* of Selden. This very enumeration is a tribute to Dr. Hamilton's industry. It was manifestly no small task to run down all the right passages. One is even more amazed at Flaubert's patient industry, at his astonishing fidelity to his theory that the facts must

tell their own story, at his supreme artistry that fused such a variety of material into this really wonderful chapter. There can be few better examples of a romantic imagination working with as solid material as could be gathered by the most realistic method, and it is interesting to observe again and again how the artist is nearly always more concise than his sources, and how often he raises them to the level of imaginative literature by the addition of an image or by throwing into relief a concrete and picturesque detail.

Dr. Hamilton has been successful in finding the sources of nearly all the passages bearing on the religious element. Perhaps the longest that remains to be studied is that describing the funeral rites of the barbarians (pp. 279-81). The reader's curiosity is also piqued by several briefer passages, as, for instance, the oath of Narr'Havas (p. 113), and the striking mystic sentence in the description of Hamilcar's prayer: "Il s'efforçait à bannir de sa pensée toutes les formes, tous les symboles et les appellations des dieux, afin de mieux saisir l'esprit immuable que les apparences dérobaient" (p. 142).

The final chapter discusses Flaubert's utilization of his sources. Dr. Hamilton observes that, from chapter vii on, the novelist introduces historic detail in such abundance as to make it the *raison d'être* of the latter part of the book rather than the fortunes of his personages, and he ascribes this situation largely to the fact that the author's sources at this stage no longer contained elements that fired his imagination. The reason almost certainly lies deeper; it is suggested in Flaubert's own uneasiness about the psychology of his characters, an uneasiness that is not surprising when a writer with a realistic method and conscience attempts to revive souls that loved and died in vanished Carthage. No amount of documentation could recreate Punic psychology, and more than one passage in Flaubert's letters indicates that he realized this.

Dr. Hamilton concludes that Flaubert was less a novelist than a master of descriptions, that he was at his best when his imagination was stimulated by the sources on which he drew for facts, and that since *Salammô* reflects the author's personality, it is, by Flaubert's own standards, a failure. Would it not be truer to say that the weakness of *Salammô* as a novel is partly inherent in historical fiction, and partly arises from the author's very attempt at being impersonal? Had he put himself more freely into his book he would have depicted at least one human being, even at the cost of committing an anachronism; but as he was unable to resurrect souls so thoroughly dead and was rigid in the exclusion of the living present, his personages remain in a sort of limbo, caught in the veil that lies thick between us and long-destroyed Carthage.

Such a study as this will hardly lead to a revaluation of *Salammô* as a novel, but Flaubert the artist, the poet, the master-craftsman, comes out all the greater. The reader is constantly amazed and delighted at his ability to transmute the baser metals into his own fine gold.

There is an unpleasantly large number of typographical errors in this volume, due probably to printing conditions in France in war time, and the style is occasionally awkward and always neutral. The reader is perhaps even a little shocked to find the phrase "clear, interesting descriptions" applied to the colorful and highly poetic pages of the fifth chapter of *Salammô*.

A. COLEMAN

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

